

Mr. O'NEILL. I agreed to yield to the gentleman from New York, [Mr. WILLIS,] who desires to finish his speech on the Geneva award.

Mr. LORD. I move that the House now resume the consideration of the bill for the distribution of the unappropriated moneys of the Geneva award.

Mr. HURLBUT. In view of the peculiar circumstances attending the adoption of the report just agreed to there ought to be no further business to-day.

Mr. LORD. I think so, too.

Mr. O'NEILL. I insist on my motion to adjourn. I do not think the House desires to transact further business to-day.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of their clerks, informed the House that the Senate had passed a bill (S. No. 525) to amend section 994 of the Revised Statutes relating to justices of the peace in the District of Columbia; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

J. A. YECKLEY.

Mr. DURHAM, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 3724) for the relief of First Lieutenant J. A. Yeckley, Twentieth United States Infantry; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. PAGE, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 3725) to amend sections 5185 and 5186 of the Revised Statutes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

#### FORT SILL.

Mr. BANNING, by unanimous consent, reported back from the Committee on Military Affairs a letter from Colonel Mackenzie, relative to matters at Fort Sill; which was recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### SALE OF MILITIA ARMS.

Mr. BANNING also, by unanimous consent, presented the petition of B. Kittredge & Co., of Cincinnati; John L. Moore's Sons, of New York, and other wholesale dealers in military and sporting arms in Saint Louis, New Orleans, and Philadelphia, setting forth that new and good arms issued by the General Government to the States for the armament of the militia, bearing the inspection-mark of the Government, have been thrown upon the market in the city of New York and other places, and asking for legislation preventing executives in States from selling arms issued for the armament of the militia; which was referred to the Committee on the Militia.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was given as follows:

- To Mr. BRADLEY for ten days;
- To Mr. BURCHARD, of Illinois, for one week;
- To Mr. BLAIR for five days;
- To Mr. SCALES for ten days; and
- To Mr. ASHE for two weeks.

#### GENERAL LAFAYETTE'S GRANDSON.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair desires to lay before the House the following letter from Thurlow Weed.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK, June 9, 1876.

MY DEAR SIR: Half a century ago General Lafayette revisited America, and as the guest of the nation made a triumphal tour of the States. As you know by reading and tradition, the affection and enthusiasm and gratitude awakened by that visit have no parallel in the world's history. Would it not be equally appropriate and wise half a century after the visit of his grandfather to invite Oscar Lafayette as the guest of the nation to attend the centennial anniversary of our Independence?

Our committee has decided to invite M. Lafayette, but it has occurred to me that Congress might think proper to give broader and deeper effect to a patriotic idea.

Very truly yours,

THURLOW WEED.

Hon. S. S. Cox.

The letter was referred to the Committee on the Centennial Exposition.

The question was then taken on Mr. O'NEILL's motion that the House adjourn, and it was agreed to—ayes 94, noes 42.

The House accordingly (at three o'clock and forty-five minutes p. m.) adjourned.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

The following memorials, petitions, and other papers were presented at the Clerk's desk under the rule, and referred as stated:

By Mr. BANNING: The petition of Alvah W. Hicks, for compensation for extraordinary, perilous, and valuable services in running the blockade at Fort Pillow in June, 1862, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, the petition of Louis Sonntag, of Company I, Third New Jersey Cavalry, that the records of the War Department be so changed as to show that he was honorably discharged from the Army, to the same committee.

By Mr. BRADLEY: The petition of John H. Russell, that Congress confirm to him the location of certain lands at the Hot Springs, Ar-

kansas, and vest the title to the same in him, to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JENKS: A paper relating to a post-route from Brockwayville, via Dubois, to Luthersburgh, Pennsylvania, to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MCCRARY: The petition of Thaddeus S. Stewart, for action upon his petition for a pension, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLAISTED: The petition of Samuel Kealiber, for a pension, to the Committee on Revolutionary Pensions.

By Mr. SAVAGE: Papers relating to the claim of T. Worthington, late colonel Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteers, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALLACE, of Pennsylvania: Petitions for the acknowledgment of God and Christianity in the Constitution of the United States, signed by 1,083 persons residing in the States of Kansas, Nebraska, California, Oregon, and Colorado and Washington Territories, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of similar import, signed by 3,645 persons residing in the States of Wisconsin, Iowa, and Missouri, to the same committee.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, June 13, 1876.

The House met at twelve o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. I. L. TOWNSEND.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

#### GO-SI UTES.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an estimate of an appropriation for the removal of the Go-si Utes to the Uintah reservation; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### TAX ON DOMESTIC BEERS.

Mr. HANCOCK, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee of Ways and Means:

*Resolved*, That the Committee of Ways and Means be, and hereby are, directed to inquire into the propriety of relieving from taxation all domestic, fermented, or brewed beers.

#### LAND CLAIMS IN FLORIDA, LOUISIANA, AND MISSOURI.

Mr. WELLS, of Missouri, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 3726) to extend the provisions of an act entitled "An act for the final adjustment of land claims in the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Missouri, and for other purposes;" which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims, and ordered to be printed.

#### JAMES M. SEEDS.

Mr. BANNING, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back, with an amendment, the bill (H. R. No. 1578) for the relief of James M. Seeds, and moved that the bill, as amended, and the accompanying report, be printed, and referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

#### H. NELSON.

Mr. JOHN REILLY, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back, with an adverse recommendation, the bill (H. R. No. 1395) for the relief of H. Nelson, of the county of Warren, State of Pennsylvania; and the same was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### PATRICK O'CONNELL.

Mr. JOHN REILLY also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, reported back, with an adverse recommendation, the petition of Patrick O'Connell, late captain Company F, First Ohio Volunteer Infantry; and the same was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

#### POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HOLMAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported back the bill (H. R. No. 3263) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments of the Senate be non-concurred in. The amendments of the Senate were non-concurred in.

Mr. HOLMAN moved to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendments were non-concurred in; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### MARY E. SHELTON.

Mr. TERRY, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back the bill (H. R. No. 1661) for the relief of Mary E. Shelton, and moved that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the same, and that it be referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

## STATE-BANK-CIRCULATION TAX.

Mr. ROBERTS, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 3727) to reduce the tax on circulation of State banks to an amount equal to that paid by national banks; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM H. CARMEN.

Mr. STRAIT, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back a bill (H. R. No. 1240) for the relief of William H. Carmen, with amendments; which were referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ALFRED FRY.

Mr. STRAIT also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, reported back a bill (H. R. No. 1312) for the relief of the heirs of Alfred Fry; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

## LOAN OF ARTILLERY TO PATERSON, NEW JERSEY.

Mr. CUTLER, by unanimous consent, introduced a joint resolution (H. R. No. 125) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the authorities of the city of Paterson, New Jersey, four pieces of artillery, to be used in celebrating July 4, 1876; which was read a first and second time.

The joint resolution, which was read, authorizes the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Paterson, New Jersey, from the most convenient Government arsenal, four pieces of artillery, to be used by said city in celebrating the 4th of July, 1876, said artillery to be returned immediately after said celebration at the risk and expense of said city authorities.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know I will object to the introduction of this resolution. In common with a great many other members I have received applications of this kind for loan of cannon. I will not be so ungracious as to object to the passage of the resolution, but I call the attention of the House here is an entering-wedge to the loan by the Government of a great many cannon, for if you loan in this instance you must in all others.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CUTLER moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

## CLOTHING TO ENLISTED MEN IN THE NAVY.

Mr. ROBBINS, of Pennsylvania, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported back adversely a bill (H. R. No. 1090) providing for the outfit and yearly allowance of clothing to enlisted men and boys in the Navy; which was laid on the table.

## ENLISTED MEN IN THE NAVY.

Mr. ROBBINS, of Pennsylvania, also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, reported back adversely a bill (H. R. No. 2007) to protect the interest of enlisted men and others in the Navy; which was laid on the table.

## UTAH WESTERN RAILROAD.

Mr. HARDENBERGH, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back a bill (H. R. No. 2652) granting the right of way to the Utah Western Railroad through Rush Lake military reservation; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

## SIGNAL SERVICE.

Mr. HARDENBERGH also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, reported back a bill (H. R. No. 222) to extend the operations of the Signal Service of the Army so as to benefit the public health; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

## ORRA WILDER.

Mr. HARDENBERGH also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, reported back adversely the petition of Orra Wilder; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

## HEIRS OF D. S. MILES.

Mr. HARDENBERGH also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, reported back adversely the petition of the heirs of Colonel D. S. Miles; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

## DEPOSITS OF PUBLIC MONEY.

Mr. THOMAS, by unanimous consent, from the Committee of Ways and Means, moved that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of a bill (H. R. No. 1852) to amend sections 5490 and 5497 of the Revised Statutes regulating the deposits of public money,

and that it be laid on the table, and the following letter ordered to be printed in the RECORD; which motion was agreed to:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, April 20, 1876.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a bill to amend sections 5490 and 5497 of the Revised Statutes regulating the deposits of public moneys, (H. R. No. 1852,) on the merits of which you ask my opinion.

Under the provisions of the bill in question, collectors of internal revenue whose offices are located more than twenty miles from any authorized depository will not be prohibited from depositing their collections with private bankers nor the bankers prohibited from receiving the same.

Under the present law and regulations such collections must be deposited with some public depository daily or as soon as the same shall amount to \$1,000, and at the close of each month regardless of the amount accumulated.

It is of course very desirable that money belonging to the United States shall, as soon as practicable, pass from the hands of the collectors to the Treasurer's credit in the subtreasury offices or national-bank depositories, where it can be held with greater safety and be subject to the demands of the Government for current disbursement. Internal-revenue taxes are payable only in current funds, and I am aware of no convenience or necessity of the public service which would be served by permitting their deposit, when collected, in private banks.

Very respectfully,

B. H. BRISTOW, Secretary.

HON. WILLIAM R. MORRISON,  
Chairman of Committee of Ways and Means,  
House of Representatives.

## DETAIL OF OFFICERS.

Mr. TERRY, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back a bill (S. No. 166) to amend section 1225 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill, which was read, provides that section 1225 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be so amended as to read: "That the number of officers so detailed shall not exceed thirty" instead of twenty in said section provided.

Mr. HOLMAN. Does this come before the House by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It does.

Mr. HOLMAN. It was objected to on yesterday.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is too late to object now.

Mr. HOLMAN. It shows the absolute necessity of insisting on the regular order. My friend from Tennessee asked the passage of that bill out of order yesterday.

Mr. DIBRELL. No, on Saturday last.

Mr. HOLMAN. Well, on Saturday last. It was not to be expected it would be again offered out of order.

Mr. TERRY. It was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs on Saturday and was acted on this morning, and I was instructed to report it to the House favorably.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. What has been done this morning has been done by unanimous consent.

Mr. HOLMAN. I perceive it is too late to raise the question of order on the bill or to object to its consideration at this time. I am aware a bill that is in conflict with our general purpose of retrenchment while it happens to favor our local interests is apt to receive favorable consideration. I am aware of that, but I believed that inasmuch as this legislation was directly across the track we are attempting to pursue it could at least be postponed until its impolicy could be made manifest. With the steady effort to reduce the number of officers down to some reasonable proportion the argument is constantly raised in favor of increasing rather than diminishing their number.

I know of no reason why for the purpose of furnishing professors to the institutions of learning throughout the country, in which inevitably a large degree of favoritism must be shown, a large body of employes on the part of the Federal Government should be kept up at a heavy expense, a system creating in many instances unhappy results in the institutions of learning in view of the difference between the salaries paid by the Federal Government and those paid by the more carefully organized institutions of learning. This discrimination produces dissatisfaction and discontent.

Mr. ATKINS. Will the gentleman allow me to suggest that at this time there is a surplus of officers of the Army and there is likely to be one for some time, and that it is well to assign them to some duties?

Mr. HOLMAN. I do know it; and my friend from Tennessee is aware of the fact that so long as this kind of legislation is kept up and new places for Federal officers are furnished, so long will the restoration of the Government to its old basis and to the simplicity of the olden times be absolutely impossible. If it is found that there is a supernumerary body of officers, then, instead of dispensing with their services and retrenching expenditures, the question seems to be to find what new field of employment can be found for them under the pay of the Federal Government.

But, sir, the bill is before the House. I was not aware of its being reported out of order, and I do not now object to it, because it is too late to object.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Please allow me a few minutes.

The people I have the honor to represent are very much interested in the passage of this bill. Cornell College, at Mount Vernon, Iowa, was one of the first institutions of learning in the country to test the practicability of teaching military science and tactics in connection with academic studies, under the law of Congress authorizing the

Secretary of War to detail military officers for that purpose. From careful inquiry into the work of the gentleman detailed, (Lieutenant Webster,) I am well satisfied that the experiment is successful. Two hundred young men are organized, uniformed, and armed, outside of West Point. The officer asserts their equals in regard to the acquirements of every mental and physical acquisition in that particular line are difficult to find. The boys like it, their parents indorse it, and the faculty testify to marked improvement in hitherto commendable deportment. The State University has lately applied for and has had assigned an instructor, Lieutenant Schenck, from the War Department, under whose management the university students are being successfully organized and educated in military tactics and science.

So far the success has been all that could be desired; but the limits of the law have been reached, and colleges in other States are asking for details. We must surrender one of these gentlemen or increase the number the Secretary of War may detail.

I can imagine no good reason why in time of peace a few of the regular-Army officers cannot be allowed to impart the instructions in civil institutions of learning they have received from the General Government at public expense. There is much that is taught in a military school that is valuable if a boy never sees active service, especially the mental discipline resulting from the very thorough study of mathematics. Besides this, the private schools have no other depository of learning of this kind from which to secure professors to fill these particular chairs. It has been earnestly urged here this session that we have a surplus of Army officers and that many of them should be mustered out. Why not permit them first to give the country the benefit of their acquirements in military training? Let the information they possess in this direction become the property of several classes in some of our colleges in each State and the chairs afterward can be easily filled from the graduates.

It will only be a question of time when each State can furnish military education as readily as any other.

Our future soldiers may as well receive their training at home as abroad. The repugnance felt by many of our best families to sending their boys away from home to a military school will not prevent them from permitting the boys to acquire much that is beneficial in the discipline of a soldier.

The objection raised by the gentleman from Indiana, that the difference between the salary paid the officer and member of the college faculty creates jealousy, does not obtain in Iowa, because we pay our faculties as much as the Government pays a lieutenant, and in some colleges much more.

I hope my friend from Indiana will waive his opposition just long enough to let us become possessed of this art from its proper source. I sympathize with him in most of his efforts toward economy, but in Iowa we consider liberal expenditures to educate, the truest economy. My district supports five colleges with complete faculties, the number of students in each numbering from three hundred to seven hundred and fifty of both sexes. The State of Iowa pays \$5,000,000 annually to support the common schools. Congress cannot stop us from educating in every direction. We want you to help us just here.

Iowa College, at Grinnell, has succeeded in securing an instructor in military science outside of the regular Army. I am inclined to think, however, that he received his education at West Point, which proves that such education is in demand even outside of colleges that have the benefit of an officer from the War Department. The bill under consideration increases the number that may be detailed from twenty to thirty, and I do not think they could possibly be better employed. I thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TERRY] for his courtesy to me.

Mr. HOLMAN. A single word in reply to the gentleman from Iowa. The gentleman seems to misapprehend the spirit of my remarks. I object to the bill not simply upon the grounds I have mentioned, which is that it stands in the way of retrenchment and a diminution of the number of employes of the Government, but I object especially to the bill because it belongs to a class of legislation which is more fatal and ruinous to this Government than any other class of legislation. It indicates a tendency to legislate not for the whole people of the United States, not in the interests of the whole mass of the people, but in the interest of special and privileged classes.

Will you tell me, sir, why a few institutions of learning, by the aid of the Federal Treasury, shall be benefited or encouraged while the great body of the American people, those who have not even obtained the benefit of a common-school education, those who are yet without common-school facilities, are limited in the opportunities of education, are debarred of these opportunities to receive the fostering care of the General Government?

Mr. HURLBUT. Where did Ohio get her common-school fund from, or Indiana?

Mr. HOLMAN. Why is it that Congress is willing to promote the fortunes of colleges and the higher grades of education, while every effort made to meet the wants of the whole people of the country, the living masses of our children who are to take upon themselves in a few years the reins of government, meets the objection that that kind of legislation does not come within the purview and power of Congress? Special legislation is unhappily the favorite employment of the Congress of the United States; we are constantly enacting laws in the interest of particular classes. The legislation of such a body as Congress should be confined to the enactment of laws affect-

ing the whole body of our people, and for the benefit of every child no matter how humble it may be, who should receive from the law exactly the same benefits as any other child, no matter how favored by fortune. It is because this is a measure of special and class legislation that I object to it.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. One word in reply. I agree with the gentleman in his views relative to universal education. I have just this to say, that if Congress will permit us to draw on this sole depository of this class of knowledge until we have educated one set of boys, then we will find our instructors at home.

Mr. DIBRELL. This application came up from the East Tennessee University, situated at Knoxville, with upward of three hundred students, one of the finest institutions of learning in the country. When Senator KEY of my State made application to the Secretary of War for an officer for this purpose, he was told that the number allowed by law had already been detailed. He introduced a bill to increase the number of officers to be so detailed from twenty to twenty-five, and the Senate increased the number to thirty, and passed the bill. I hope the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] will withdraw his objection to this bill. We have a surplus of Army officers, and we cannot obtain better instructors than they are for this purpose.

Mr. BANNING. One word only. The object of this bill is to give to the young men throughout the country some of the advantages that are now enjoyed only by the young men who are fortunate enough to be appointed to West Point. Under the law as it now is twenty officers may be detailed, not to colleges alone, but to any school in the country that has an attendance of one hundred and fifty students. These details are made only to such institutions as ask for them. When the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] objects to this detailing of Army officers for this purpose and says that it has been attended with unhappy results, I reply to him that it is not the fault of the law, but the fault of the institutions. No officer is forced upon any institution; no institution in the country obtains the services of one of these officers unless it asks for him.

This bill increases by ten the number of officers that may be detailed for this purpose. Those ten are already asked for by schools that wish to add military education to that already afforded by the institution. As has been already stated, there is a surplus of officers who might much better be performing this duty of teaching the young men of the country than loafing around military posts and doing nothing.

The Government can well afford to do this, to permit these officers to educate our young men and prepare them for military service if we ever again shall need such service. Every gentleman on this floor knows full well the advantages that would have resulted to the country had this course been pursued before the war.

This bill has already passed the Senate. It is no new idea, but an old one; one that has been adopted and in force ever since the war. The number of officers to be detailed is increased by this bill from twenty to thirty, because the people throughout the country ask for them. When my friend from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] says that this advantage applies only to colleges and not to the general public, I think he makes a very feeble objection to the bill. At present these officers can educate young men only at West Point. This bill allows officers to be detailed to thirty different colleges throughout the country and to give to the students of those colleges the benefit of the education these officers have received at the expense of the Government. The objection that this only goes to the aristocratic colleges is without foundation. This bill proposes to increase the opportunities of military education from the few to the many. When my friend makes that objection, he shows that he has not studied the bill. I hope it will be passed without further objection.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. I am in favor of this bill, because I know of the good results that have come from the detail of officers of the Army for service in military academies. There is a military academy in my district at Chester, under the superintendence of Colonel Hyatt, which academy has for its instructor an officer of the Army. It is one of the best mathematical institutions of the country and at the same time one of the best-drilled military institutions in the United States. Competent judges who have witnessed the drill of the students there have no hesitation in saying that it is not surpassed by the drill at West Point.

With regard to the objection made by the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HOLMAN,] that this applies merely to aristocratic institutions, I want to say to him that the military academy of which I speak is a purely democratic institution; it has the education of boys from all parts of the country, the poor as well as the rich; and a better institution of the kind is nowhere to be found. Before the war it was under military discipline, the school was in charge of a gentleman who had been in the Army. It was then in a high state of military discipline and excellence, and it afforded during the rebellion several young men who afterward turned out to be excellent officers of the Army.

I think this is the best way in which we can employ our supernumerary officers of the Army, to allow them to give this military instruction to the students of academies and colleges, so that hereafter when a war may come upon us, whether foreign or of an internecine character, there shall be men educated and capable of disciplining the armies that we may find it necessary to employ for national defense. I trust, therefore, that this bill may pass.

Mr. TERRY. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. HURLBUT.]

Mr. HURLBUT. Mr. Speaker, I want the House thoroughly to understand that under the existing law the number of officers who can be detailed for the use of schools, colleges, and universities throughout the country is limited to twenty. The demand from all parts of the Union for additional officers to be detailed for this purpose is overwhelming. It is not confined to any one portion of the country. This bill proposes simply to allow a detail of thirty instead of twenty, making ten additional officers disposable for this purpose. I had no idea that any gentleman here would object to the measure. I do not believe any gentleman would have objected except the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HOLMAN,] and his grounds of objection, considering the section of country that he represents, are astonishing; for his section, like my own, lives to-day, so far as education is concerned, upon the bounty of this nation.

Mr. HOLMAN. My friend will allow me to say, however, that it is a bounty which extends to every child in the community, which is not specially applied to a few out of many thousands of youth, and these the most favored already by fortune.

Mr. HURLBUT. If the gentleman will increase the Army so that we can detail an officer for every public school in the country, I have no objection. We ought not to object to giving this advantage to those who ask it, just so far as our means can go; and the idea that it is a breach of the ordinary habit or principles of the Government to apply either its men or its means to the education of the people is a falsification of the history of the whole country. When Virginia gave the Northwestern Territory to the Union, she accompanied the gift by a reservation from which have sprung the large and valuable school funds of all the Northwestern States. No greater gift was ever given to this nation than was given by Virginia in that reservation for the establishment of schools; and the gentleman from Indiana knows it, because he himself is one of the offspring of that school system.

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly. That is what I have been boasting of. It is that system I have been advocating; not a partial, discriminating system which would extend certain privileges to thirty colleges of the country at the expense of the mass of the people.

Mr. HURLBUT. The gentleman does not do any credit to the liberality of the Government which has educated him and thousands of others.

Now, sir, this is merely a proposition to extend to such institutions of learning throughout the country as desire to take it the benefit of the services of these officers. We have them now disposable for this purpose, without injury to the service; and I think we are going to have them, the gentleman from Indiana to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. HOLMAN. The gentleman will allow me to say that I do owe to this Government and its bounty the little education I have. I obtained it through the common-school system. The common school is the true university of this nation—the one that is entitled to and has received the fostering care of this Government; for it has sought to reach every child in the nation. The gentleman, by this bill, would give the benefit of the fostering care of the Government not to all the children of the country, but he would assign to one out of ten colleges—perhaps one out of twenty or one out of thirty—the benefit of an educated professor, while he would deprive all other institutions of learning of such an advantage. The gentleman would carry on this Government upon the principle of the olden time—the principle of favoring a particular class—while I advocate legislation which, with its beneficent influence, reaches alike every citizen of the nation.

Mr. HURLBUT. O! I have heard that ever since I was born.

Mr. HOLMAN. I know you have; and you will hear it hereafter.

Mr. TERRY. I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. HOOKER.]

Mr. HOOKER. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if the House understood the original law as it stands upon the statute-book and the amendment proposed in the pending bill there could not be any very material objection to the passage of the measure. The only one which I have heard is that emanating from the gentleman from Indiana; and it is predicated upon the idea that, because you cannot extend the benefit of this provision to every school in the country, however small it may be in its numbers or limited in its operations, therefore you should deny it altogether. If the original act had any virtue in it, the amendment now proposed will simply extend the benefits and advantages accruing from such a course of instruction to other schools than those now embraced in it.

It should be observed that the provision of the section now proposed to be amended is limited in its application to schools having capacity to instruct one hundred and fifty male students; and authority is given to the President of the United States and the Secretary of War to make the designation of such officers of the Army as can be spared for the purpose of giving this instruction. I ask that the original section may be read from the Clerk's desk in order that its provisions may be understood. I think then there can be no possible objection to the bill now proposed, which is designed simply to enlarge and extend the privileges of the existing law.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1235. The President may, upon the application of any established college or university within the United States having capacity to educate, at the same time, not less than one hundred and fifty male students, detail an officer of the Army to

act as president, superintendent, or professor thereof; but the number of officers so detailed shall not exceed twenty at any time, and they shall be apportioned throughout the United States, as nearly as may be practicable, according to population. Officers so detailed shall be governed by general rules prescribed, from time to time, by the President. The Secretary of War is authorized to issue, at his discretion and under proper regulations to be prescribed by him, out of any small-arms or pieces of field-artillery belonging to the Government and which can be spared for that purpose, such number of the same as may appear to be required for military instruction and practice by the students of any college or university under the provisions of this section; and the Secretary shall require a bond in each case, in double the value of the property, for the care and safe-keeping thereof, and for the return of the same when required. (See section 1667.)

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask the gentleman whether he approves of the class legislation involved in the first section of this bill?

Mr. HOOKER. Well, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana I will not say that I do not suppose anybody thinks it would be possible to constitute a military academy in every school in this country, but I do approve the allowing of officers of the Army who may be disengaged and where without any additional expense it can be done, to instruct the pupils in the various schools designated in the original act. I do approve of it. I see no impropriety in it, and I am unable to see the force of the argument that, because the benefit intended to be conferred upon particular schools and colleges cannot be extended to every old field school in the country, therefore it ought not to be extended to a sufficient number under the terms of the original act to allow them to be organized into military academies to drill their scholars in military science.

Mr. HOLMAN. As a measure of legislation this provision of law goes to the very extremity of special class legislation. I hold, sir, it is the duty of Congress to legislate in such manner as directly to reach the whole of our people with the beneficent influence of the law, and not to promote simply the private interest of any particular class at the expense of the whole people.

Mr. HOOKER. Then you ought to move to repeal the original act.

Mr. BANKS. Mr. Speaker, the law to which this bill from the Senate is an amendment originated in 1836 and 1867. I remember the circumstances very well. It was carefully examined and considered by the educational interests of the country. As the question was presented to the House it originated mainly with an officer of the Army who had been debarred from participating in the controversies of past years but desired to do something for his country, and the idea occurred to him that the extension of the means of military education was one of those subjects to which he could well devote himself. All the educational interests of the country were consulted in regard to it. In the first instance there was not a university, or academy, or educational interest or element that expressed an opinion against it. Then it came to the Executive Departments of the Government, and after full examination it was confirmed by them, and the two Houses of Congress passed the bill with scarcely any objection. And I am glad to know after ten or twelve years it has so far vindicated itself in practice as to justify the extension of the principles and methods of education which are embodied in this bill.

Now, sir, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] is in error in supposing this is limited to any class at all. It is not limited to any class, unless the subject of military education can be said of itself to be absolutely limited to a class. The proposition is for the Government that has an institution for the education of persons in military science, and who by that education become themselves professors of military art and military science, to allow the service of those officers to be extended to the universities of the country for the purpose of teaching and imparting the theories and principles of that science, that military art, to the students generally throughout the country, to all the students of the country, of whatever character, and wherever they may be.

Mr. HOLMAN rose.

Mr. BANKS. Wait one moment, and I will come to your point. That was as far as the Government could do it. It was limited in the first instance to a few universities, three or four, which had made application, having examined the subject and desired that assistance and were willing to make the experiment. It is now proposed to be extended still further.

Let me ask the attention of the gentleman from Indiana to this point. These professors, these West Point graduates if you please, afterward become professors, the scholars of the universities become professors in the academies, imparting military science, the military history of the country, and comprehension of the military art to all other students. The students of the universities who have become educated in this way in military science become in time teachers of the higher schools; teachers of the middle schools; teachers of the lower schools. Each one as he moves from this central point imparts his knowledge, science, and attainments, until ultimately they extend to all the students in the lower schools as well as in the higher schools. So that in the end every person who becomes a teacher will have acquired more or less of this knowledge of the military art and military science, and will impart it to the pupils of every school in the country without exception, restriction, or limitation. There is not a school in the district which I represent which may not in the end be benefited directly, not indeed by the professor who may come from West Point, but by the acquisition of this military science on the part of the pupils of these universities, who in the end become teachers of the lower schools, and finally instruct all the people of the country in this art.

Let me say a word about the object and necessity of this kind of instruction in this country. Military science has been limited to a single school. I cannot say it is due to the fact I propose to speak of, but it will have in the end the effect of creating a class of men devoted to military science alone, and who in case of trouble, whether among ourselves or with foreign nations, will become themselves the sole representatives of this military art, and military science. And we turn to them, sir; to them alone. The whole country is taught to regard them as the only persons upon whom we can rely for defense. Why? Because there is no other military education, generally speaking, except that which is given to them; and as a matter of course they will, having rendered the country great services in this way, in good time become the representatives of the civil power as well as of the military power; and thus seriously will be undermined the very foundations of republican or democratic government.

Does the gentleman from Indiana propose or desire any such result as this? I know he cannot. I know he does not. But that is the effect of the policy which he advocates. I am not for war. For the whole of my life I have resisted, as far as I was able, any appeal to arms. I am not afraid to repeat what I have said here often, and in my own part of the country still more frequently, that we have never gained anything by an appeal to arms that we could not better have gained in other ways. But it takes two men to keep peace, while one man can make war. Therefore we must be prepared for war. And to be prepared for war it is not enough that we have a class educated to that kind of business which sometimes comes to a republic as well as to an empire or monarchy. The whole people must be capable of defending themselves; and the country never will and never can be able to defend itself until the whole people shall have more or less of this instruction and this faculty. And this is the best, the wisest, and the most democratic method that can be devised to impart this education to the young people of the country who need it and desire it.

I hope, therefore, inasmuch as this bill from the Senate is only a limitation or restriction upon the idea, fixing a point beyond which we shall not go, that the House will give its assent to it.

Mr. HOLMAN. Can the gentleman from Massachusetts possibly assume that this measure is in any sense a measure of general application, when a great number of the children of this nation are not even provided under the fostering care of this Government with the benefits of a common-school education and a still vaster number under the fortunes that surround them can only have the benefits of a common-school education, and no efforts are being made on the part of the Federal Government to increase the facilities of the great body of our children to obtain even those benefits? Nor do gentlemen assume that the Federal Government should take the general subject of education under its charge. Can the gentleman, therefore, say that a law like this is general in its purposes which is so partial in its effects that it reaches only to the sons of those of our citizens who are able to secure to their children much beyond the benefits of a common-school education? Can a law be more partial than this? And you do not even propose to extend this law to all the colleges in the various States. You do not confer even upon the young men of all the higher institutions of learning in each State of the Union the benefit of this particular form of education which the distinguished gentleman esteems so valuable for the citizens of this country.

I cannot imagine a law more partial even in its operation, and I hold that a republican government forgets its highest obligation when it confers upon any class of citizens, except in connection with the administration of the government, rights and opportunities which do not belong in common to the whole people. I abhor that legislation which confers special benefits on the few and withholds them from the greater number. We can well understand why in that great country from whence we drew our origin a few institutions of learning, and notably those of Oxford and Cambridge, should be fostered by government and should have become pillars of the state. It is because there the state in the main rests upon a favored class of its people. But that any one should contend that in a government of the people that system of education should be fostered which reaches and benefits only a favored class, while multitudes of the generation that is coming are left destitute of the benefits of that degree of education which would fit them for citizenship, is to me incomprehensible.

I hold on the subject of education that whatever qualifies a citizen for the duties of citizenship should be alike common to all, and that any legislation upon that subject which does not tend to that result is not in harmony with the genius and spirit of our republican institutions. It is true that the Federal Government, in view of the greater efficiency and noble rivalry of the States, may not enter upon the general field of education, but the spirit of our institutions demands that every aid the Federal Government shall extend to the high cause of education should be as broad as the Republic and reach in its beneficent influences every child of the nation.

The defense of West Point and the Naval Academy has always been that they were not simply institutions of learning, but necessary agents of the Government in the organization of its armies; institutions having no relations to the general education of the people, but the organization of the military and naval forces of the Government.

Mr. HOOKER. I desire to make a single inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana. Am I correct in understanding the gentleman from

Indiana as arguing that because you cannot impart military instruction to every single youth in the land you should impart it to none?

Mr. HOLMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi scarcely supposes that a branch of learning which may come into use once perhaps in the progress of two or three generations should be the subject of the special fostering care of this Government as a feature of its general system of education. It is a branch of learning the necessity for which is happily passing away. It was well enough for the Middle Ages, and it was a natural feature in the conflicting despotisms of Europe, where organized armies kept the people in subjection. It is the education of monarchies, not of republics. But the idea is becoming abhorrent even in liberal monarchies that education in the murderous art of war should be a special object of the Government. The grand idea that it is through the education and agencies of peace that the whole human race should be elevated swells the heart of our period. In these circumstances does the gentleman think it necessary that the Federal Government should foster by a heavy taxation of the people education in the art of war?

Mr. HOOKER. That is avoiding my inquiry.

Mr. HOLMAN. No, sir; when this Government, through its great and prosperous States, shall have furnished to every child in the land the benefit of a common-school education, so that he shall be prepared to enter on the high duties of citizenship armed and equipped, it will have accomplished a great work worthy of the Republic and of the age. I would rejoice in seeing that standard of education raised higher and higher, but I insist that it shall in its progress be so directed that it shall reach alike every child of the Republic so far as the system of education shall be under the fostering care of the Government, whether remote or direct.

The spirit of special legislation should be dying out. Favoritism in legislation is against the spirit of the age. This, I hope, is one of its last struggles. The spirit of universality is the one that inspires the nation, especially in all its purposes for the education and elevation of its people.

Mr. BANNING. I would ask the gentleman if this does not make the military education of the people far more general than it now is?

Mr. HOLMAN. It applies to but a handful of the youth of the nation. My friend claiming to be a republican—I use the term in its highest sense—and a democrat and is yet favoring a system of legislation that would open up superior opportunities to a few boys who have already had superior advantages of education by good fortune above their fellows, and would furnish to them at the expense of the whole people the opportunity to pursue a class of studies from which the great mass of the youth of the country are debarred. Is this democracy?

Mr. BANNING. The gentleman is defending a system which proposes to educate our youth in this branch only at one college, while this bill proposes to educate them at thirty.

Mr. HOLMAN. Why, certainly not; the one college is for the benefit of the Government, not for the benefit of education. I would willingly see West Point abolished; but it has been the policy of the Government through long years to foster that institution as a necessity of Government, and traditions have gathered around West Point investing it with a glow of patriotism and almost of reverence to the American people. We preserve it as a tradition of the Republic and an agent of Government, not as simply an institution of learning; while this bill involves a matter of the common education of the whole people. My friend forgets that the moment that he breaks loose from the grand doctrine of America, the fundamental idea of our Government, that whatever appertains to the rights and immunities of the citizens shall be equal and common to all—that whenever he breaks loose from that principle and ventures into the traditions of the middle-age system, then he meets at every step the principles of republican government springing up to confront him. Let us have laws of education that shall not discriminate in favor of a portion of our citizens, but apply alike to all. It is for that reason that I object to a system of legislation which in the matter of education singles out a handful of our youths and gives them, at the expense of the nation, further advantages of education than those they already enjoy in being educated in the higher branches of learning.

Mr. ATKINS. I desire to know if this debate is continuing under any rule?

Mr. TERRY. I did intend saying a word in reply to the gentleman from Indiana on the matter of economy, but so much has been said upon this subject that I will not further detain the House, but will call the previous question.

Mr. HOLMAN. I attach no such weight to the question of economy as I do to the question of principle involved here.

Mr. BANKS. I hope the gentleman from Virginia will allow me to answer a question put to me by the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. TERRY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BANKS. The gentleman asked me a question and I want to answer it in the affirmative. He inquires if this measure is one that reaches the common schools of the country, if the pupils of the common schools are to reap the advantages of it, and I answer that they are. There are no common schools without the higher school of education. It is from them that we get teachers and professors, and it there is to be any military education in this country of a general character it must come from this measure and no other.

Now the gentleman from Indiana does not propose, as I understand

him, to interfere with the military school at West Point. He sustains that. Under his idea all the military education of the country is to be obtained there from professors under the favor of the Government. Is that a democratic institution or a democratic idea? And not only that, but he desires that all the education of a military character shall be limited to the pupils of that school, and that all the people who have military knowledge shall have been trained in that school. Does the gentleman from Indiana call that a democratic theory? Certainly not. If you are to have military education you must provide measures for general instruction. If this principle is extended, as I have no doubt it will be, and if this policy, of which this is but the beginning, shall be successful, I venture to say that it will provide military instruction for ordinary purposes in every common school in the land.

Mr. HOLMAN. Was not the experience of the last war such as to teach our people that acquirements in military science were of such a character that in a free Government like ours all that was requisite in that field of learning could be acquired almost upon the impulse of the moment? Were not some of the most successful generals of the Army men who had never devoted themselves at all to military science until the tocsin of war was sounded? And when I look at the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. BANKS,] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HURLBUT,] and others who honor this floor by their presence and shed luster upon arms in the late war, I know there can be but one answer to that question, that is, that among a free people preparation for war is always made, and there is no necessity for wasting the time of our youth in acquiring that branch of learning, when from the very spirit and nature of our institutions we are always armed and equipped.

Mr. BANKS. There is but one answer to the question which the gentleman propounds, and that is that the advantage in the beginning of the war, as I doubt not every volunteer officer and soldier of the northern army and of the southern army perhaps will admit, was absolutely and overwhelming with the graduates of West Point Academy. In the commencement of the war every man in the Army believed that it was scarcely safe to enter upon a campaign unless we had one or more of these officers in command of the volunteer forces of the Army. It is, however, true that after two or three years' experience in active service the volunteers acquired skill; and I do not stand here to say that their skill was not equal to that of the graduates of West Point Academy. But I will say this, and every soldier on this floor will justify me in saying it, that no volunteer officer, at least of the northern Army, ever for a single moment had that credit with the country, the Government, or the people for whatever services he might have performed that these graduates of West Point Academy universally received from the Government and the people. That was because the West Point graduates were supposed to have been thoroughly educated in their profession and the volunteer officers were supposed not to have been so educated. It was an injustice to the volunteer for which the country never can atone.

Mr. JONES, of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BANKS. I would prefer not to be led away from my argument.

Mr. JONES, of Kentucky. I want to ask the gentleman if he has observed how this system has been carried out heretofore? Have these officers been assigned generally among the States in proportion to population, or what has been the practice in that regard?

Mr. BANKS. It has been an experiment. Whenever a university or one of the higher schools in Kentucky, for instance, has asked the Government to assign an officer to a military professorship in that institution, the request has been granted if there have been such officers to be assigned.

Mr. JONES, of Kentucky. I understand the law very well; but I ask the gentleman if he has observed how these professors have been assigned, whether to the States generally or to particular sections?

Mr. BANKS. They have been assigned wherever they have been required; that is the intention of the law.

Mr. BLOUNT. That is not true in practice.

Mr. JONES, of Kentucky. With the permission of the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. BANKS,] I would ask the gentleman who reports this bill [Mr. TERRY] if it provides for a fair and equal assignment of these officers among the States, or is it left discretionary with the Secretary of War or the President where to assign them? If the bill does not provide for that it should do so. With such a provision I would not object to the bill; without it I would be opposed to its passage.

Mr. BANKS. The assignment is made at the discretion of the Government, because the number of officers for this purpose is not equal to the calls upon the Government for them. If you will increase the number of these officers you will have them in every section of the country, and in every school wherever wanted.

Mr. BANNING. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BANKS] permit me to answer the question of the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. JONES?]

Mr. BANKS. I prefer to go on. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] has said that this was a proposition to extend a murderous system of policy; that is, the policy of war. Permit me to say that it is exactly the opposite of that; it is a measure to strengthen the policy of peace. There is nothing that tends so much to the maintenance of

peace among individuals and among nations as a knowledge that each individual or each nation is prepared for war if forced upon him or it.

What is it that keeps the states of Europe at peace at this moment, with their seven millions of armed men? It is the knowledge that every state is prepared for war, and if war should once commence it would involve the whole of Europe. It is this preparation for war that preserves nations from war. What led the first Napoleon to his destruction? It was his belief and declaration that the people of England were a nation of shop-keepers and would not fight. What led us into our controversy so much as the belief on the one side and the other that its opponents would not fight?

To be prepared for war, to comprehend and fully understand its terrible conditions and results, is the best way to obtain and maintain peace. That was in fact the legacy of Washington. "There is a rank due to the United States among nations," he said "that will be withheld, if not absolutely lost by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid it we must be able to repel it. If we desire peace, it must be known that at all times we are ready for war." The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JONES] ought to be able to comprehend that this is a measure in the interest of peace. For myself I would never have uttered one word in favor of it, and would not now, except as a measure of peace.

Mr. JONES, of Kentucky. As an answer to some extent to my own question, I desire to call attention to the section of the Revised Statutes to which this bill relates. Section 1225, after providing that the President may detail an officer of the Army to act as president, superintendent, or professor of any established college or university having capacity to educate at the same time not less than one hundred and fifty students, goes on to provide that—

The number of officers so detailed shall not exceed twenty at any time, and they shall be apportioned throughout the United States, as nearly as may be practicable, according to population.

I hold that under that provision the Secretary of War or the President must distribute these officers fairly and justly among the States.

Mr. TERRY. Inasmuch as nobody has spoken against the bill except one gentleman, I yield to my friend from Georgia, [Mr. BLOUNT,] who I understand desires to oppose it.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised that a proposition of this sort should come from a committee on this side of the House; for it involves the right of the Federal Government to take charge of the proper education of the people in the several States. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] urges that this amendatory bill provides only for an addition of ten officers to the number allowed by existing law. But is that meeting the question properly? If this power does not reside with the Federal Government, is it not time that instead of acting on what has been done we should correct what has been erroneously done. If we may go forward in building up these institutions in the several States, where is the limit of our power? Where are the boundaries? Where is the voice that shall say, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no farther?" For one I believe that this country is not now asking for this measure. The cry is not coming up from the States for military education; the cry is not coming up for an increase of expenditures. The sentiment of the people does not favor any excuse for multiplying Army officers. If we have too many of them, more than the public service requires, let us not seek to perpetuate them upon the people of the country by assigning them to the business of educating the people.

Mr. HOOKER. Will the gentleman allow me to answer his inquiry?

Mr. BLOUNT. I will in a moment. If the excuse is that you have too many Army officers, then respond to the cries of the distressed people of the country; restrict the number of officers; reduce expenditures; take your heavy hand off the industries of the people.

Mr. HOOKER. The gentleman will allow me to say that I am not aware of anything in this bill which forces these instructors upon any State. They are never sent anywhere except at the instance of colleges that apply for them under the law. There is no power to send them unless they are called for. If they are not wanted in any State, they certainly will not be sent.

Mr. BLOUNT. If they are wanted, what right have we to appropriate money to meet a wish of that kind? Where will the gentleman find the power to appropriate money for such a purpose? If we have power to do this, why have we not power to legislate broadly on this whole subject of education? My colleague [Mr. COOK] says that no appropriation is asked for. I will tell him of one thing that is asked for, retrenchment in the expenditures of the Government. If these officers are useless for the military purposes of the country, let us not maintain these expensive salaries; let them be abolished.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. BANKS,] for whose wisdom and patriotism I have the highest regard—who never speaks without winning my attention and respect—has attempted to defend this proposition on a ground which I think is entirely untenable. He says that we tried the assignment of three officers for this purpose and found advantage from it; we then tried twenty and found advantage from it; and therefore we should increase the number. Sir, if that is the way we are to proceed where will be the end? We have thirty-seven States with a vast number of colleges scattered through them. The measure now proposed is not expected by any one to meet all the demands in this direction. When you have inaugurated this movement, where is it to stop?

Mr. Speaker, for one I feel that it is the duty of the Representatives of the people at this hour to meet wherever they can the demand for retrenchment. I appreciate the benefits to be derived from the assignment of these officers to this duty. I would like to have one in my own State; and I believe there is a pending application of that kind. But, sir, because we would like to have the services of these officers for nothing, I will not violate what I deem to be a principle of the Constitution, I will not violate the demand of the day for retrenchment. Why, sir, we have a perfect army of officers. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BANKS] attempts to magnify the great advantages of military education throughout the States. Sir, we are isolated; we are separated by a vast ocean from the other great powers of the world. Why should gentlemen try to alarm us on this subject? For one I have no fear of an invading foe. We have a gallant people ready for war whenever it shall come and capable of defending the country from all harm.

Mr. SPARKS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him wherein this increases expenditures?

Mr. BLOUNT. I will answer with a great deal of pleasure. If these Army officers can be spared from the military service of the country to be assigned to educational purposes, then they are not needed for the military purposes of the Government; and, if they are not needed, I say we have no right to maintain them for the purpose of devoting their services to the education of the people.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said about the question of economy that I will say one word. We do not propose by this measure to increase the expenses of the Government a single dollar. We have at present upon the rolls many officers whose services are not now required in the Army. If the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] will bring forward a bill to reduce the number of Army officers, I will vote for it; but while we have this large number of supernumerary officers doing nothing, I say let them be assigned to the civil institutions of learning, and let them earn their pay by giving instruction there.

Mr. HOLMAN. Why, sir, a bill reducing the number of our Army officers is now pending in the House.

Mr. TERRY. I demand the previous question.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman allow me to offer an amendment?

Mr. TERRY. No, sir; I cannot yield.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman allow it to be read?

Mr. TERRY. Yes, sir.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Provided*, That section 1225 of the Revised Statutes be so amended as to extend the privilege of a detail of an officer of the United States Army to any educational institution within the United States having a capacity to educate one hundred male students at the same time, the number of officers so detailed not to exceed thirty in all.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania. I ask the gentleman from Virginia to allow that amendment to be offered.

Mr. TERRY. I am not instructed by my committee to permit any amendments; and I must decline to comply with the gentleman's request.

Mr. GARFIELD. I ask the gentleman to yield to me that I may read a single paragraph bearing upon this subject.

Mr. TERRY. Very well.

Mr. GARFIELD. The remarks made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] were so striking on two points—first, on the constitutional power of this Congress to do anything in regard to education in the States and, second, in regard to our less need of education of this sort in an isolated country like ours—that it has occurred to me to read a paragraph from a very venerable document to which I am sure everybody in the House will listen with pleasure.

I read from the second annual message of George Washington to the Congress of the United States. After recommending Congress under the Constitution to take into consideration the care of manufactures, the advancement of agriculture and commerce, the establishment of uniformity of weights, measures, and the like. He says:

Nor am I less persuaded that you will agree with me in opinion that there is nothing which can better deserve your patronage than the promotion of science and literature. Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of public happiness. In one in which the measures of Government receive their impression so immediately from the sense of the community as in ours it is proportionably essential. To the security of a free constitution it contributes in various ways: by convincing those who are intrusted with the public administration that every valuable end of government is best answered by the enlightened confidence of the people, and by teaching the people themselves to know and to value their own rights, to discern and provide against invasions of them; to distinguish between oppression and the necessary exercise of lawful authority, between burdens proceeding from a disregard to their convenience and those resulting from the inevitable exigencies of society; to discriminate the spirit of liberty from that of licentiousness, cherishing the first, avoiding the last, and uniting a speedy but temperate vigilance against encroachments with an inviolable respect to the laws.

Now listen, and remember this is an address to Congress:

Whether this desirable object will be best promoted by affording aids to seminaries of learning already established, by the institution of a national university, or by any other expedients, will be well worthy of a place in the deliberations of the Legislature.

I commend to the gentleman who has so much fear of the constitutional powers of this Congress to do anything in encouragement of

education to ponder awhile upon this second annual message of the first President of the United States.

Mr. TERRY. I must insist on the demand for the previous question.

The previous question was seconded and the main question ordered; and under the operation thereof, the bill was ordered to a third reading, and it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. LANDERS, of Indiana, demanded the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 24, noes 133.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Not a sufficient number.

Mr. HOLMAN demanded tellers on the yeas and nays.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. TERRY were appointed.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported ayes 38, noes not counted.

So (more than one-fifth of those present having voted in the affirmative) the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 122, nays 50, not voting 117; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Adams, Atkins, Bagby, George A. Bagley, William H. Baker, Ballou, Banks, Banning, Beebe, Samuel D. Burchard, William P. Caldwell, Candler, Cannon, Cason, Caswell, Cate, Caulfield, Cochrane, Collins, Cook, Crouse, Cutler, Danford, Davis, De Bolt, Denison, Dibrell, Douglas, Dunnell, Durand, Durham, Eames, Egbert, Finley, Franklin, Frost, Garfield, Gause, Glover, Goode, Gunter, Hancock, Benjamin W. Harris, Harrison, Hartridge, Hatcher, Hendee, Henderson, Abram S. Hewitt, Hill, Hooker, Hurlbut, Jenks, Thomas L. Jones, Joyce, Kasson, Kehr, Ketcham, Kimball, Lamar, Lapham, Leavenworth, Levy, Luttrell, Lynch, Edmund W. M. Mackey, L. A. Mackey, Magoon, McDill, McMahon, Metcalfe, Miller, Monroe, Mutchler, Norton, Oliver, O'Neill, Packer, Page, Phelps, William A. Phillips, Plaisted, Poppleton, Potter, Pratt, John Reilly, Riddle, William M. Robbins, Robinson, Miles Ross, Sampson, Schleicher, Sheakley, Singleton, Sinnickson, A. Herr Smith, William E. Smith, Sparks, Spencer, Stenger, Stone, Tarbox, Teese, Terry, Thomas, Martin I. Townsend, Washington Townsend, Tufts, Turney, Van Vorhes, Robert B. Vance, Wait, Gilbert C. Walker, John W. Wallace, Ward, Whitehouse, Whitthorne, Wigginton, Charles G. Williams, James Wilson, Yeates, and Young—122.

NAYS—Messrs. Ainsworth, Anderson, Blackburn, Blount, Boone, Bradford, John Young Brown, Backner, John H. Caldwell, Chapin, John B. Clarke of Kentucky, John B. Clark, jr., of Missouri, Clymer, Culbertson, Dobbins, Eden, Forney, Fuller, Andrew H. Hamilton, Hardenbergh, Hartzell, Haymond, Goldsmith W. Hewitt, Holman, Hurd, Franklin Landers, George M. Landers, Lane, Lawrence, Lewis, Lynde, Milliken, Neal, Parsons, John F. Philips, Piper, Reagan, Rice, John Robbins, Savage, Springer, Thompson, Throckmorton, Walling, Wike, Willard, James Williams, James D. Williams, Jeremiah N. Williams, and Willis—50.

NOT VOTING—Messrs. Ashe, John H. Bagley, jr., John H. Baker, Bass, Bell, Blaine, Blair, Bland, Bliss, Bradley, Bright, William R. Brown, Horatio C. Burchard, Burleigh, Cabell, Campbell, Chittenden, Conger, Cowan, Cox, Crapo, Darrall, Davy, Ellis, Ely, Evans, Faulkner, Felton, Fort, Foster, Freeman, Frye, Gibson, Goodin, Hale, Robert Hamilton, Haralson, Henry R. Harris, John T. Harries, Hawthorn, Hays, Henkle, Hereford, Hoar, Hoge, Hopkins, Hoskins, House, Hubbell, Hunter, Hunton, Hyman, Frank Jones, Kelley, King, Knott, Le Moynes, Lord, Maish, MacDougall, McCrary, McFarland, Meade, Mills, Money, Morgan, Morrison, Nash, New, O'Brien, Odell, Payne, Pierce, Platt, Powell, Purman, Rainey, Randall, Rea, James B. Reilly, Roberts, Sobieski Ross, Rusk, Saylor, Seales, Schumaker, Seelye, Slemmons, Smalls, Southard, Strait, Stevenson, Stowell, Swann, Thornburgh, Tucker, John L. Vance, Waddell, Waldron, Charles C. B. Walker, Alexander S. Wallace, Walsh, Warren, Erastus Wells, G. Wiley Wells, Wheeler, White, Whiting, Andrew Williams, Alphens S. Williams, William B. Williams, Wilshire, Benjamin Wilson, Alan Wood, jr., Fernando Wood, Woodburn, and Woodworth—117.

So the bill was passed.

During the vote,

Mr. WILLARD stated that his colleagues, Mr. WALDRON, Mr. WILLIAM B. WILLIAMS, Mr. BRADLEY, and Mr. HUBBELL, were absent by leave of the House.

Mr. J. H. BAGLEY stated that he was paired with Mr. EVANS.

The vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. TERRY moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

#### ENROLLED BILLS.

Mr. HAMILTON, of Indiana, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

An act (H. R. No. 40) to reimburse B. F. West & Co., of Martin's Ferry, Ohio, for internal-revenue stamps stolen from Cambridge (Ohio) post-office;

An act (H. R. No. 353) to amend section 1911 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, defining the jurisdiction of Washington Territory; and

An act (H. R. No. 2441) authorizing the appointment of receivers of national banks, and for other purposes.

#### COURT OF CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, in reference to a bill of the House (H. R. No. 3481) extending the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims, and for other purposes, with accompanying papers; which was referred to the Committee on Patents, and ordered to be printed.

#### MILITARY ROADS IN ARIZONA.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the chief clerk of the War Department, transmitting a report of the Chief of Engineers on a bill (H. N. No. 3008) to provide for the construction of military roads in Arizona; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## WAREHOUSES, ETC.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the chief clerk of the War Department, transmitting copies of application for leases to build wharves, warehouses, &c., upon the east bank of the Potomac River; which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

## LIEUTENANT CHARLES METCALFE.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the chief clerk of the War Department, transmitting additional papers in the case of Lieutenant Charles Metcalfe; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## INSANE ASYLUM.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the chief clerk of the War Department, transmitting a report on admissions into the Insane Asylum of the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

## MARTHA A. ASHBURN.

Mr. COCHRANE, by unanimous consent, from the Committee of Claims, reported back adversely in the matter of the claim of Martha A. Ashburn, widow of George W. Ashburn; which was laid on the table, and the report ordered to be printed.

## INVALID PENSIONS.

Mr. JENKS. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar from a bill in order that it may be put on its passage at this time.

Mr. HURLBUT. I object to taking any bill from the Private Calendar unless some good and special reason is assigned therefor.

## GEORGE EYSTER.

Mr. THOMAS, by unanimous consent, from the Committee of Ways and Means, reported a bill (H. R. No. 3728) for the relief of George Eyster, assistant treasurer of the United States, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## EIGHTH CAVALRY MISSOURI STATE MILITIA.

Mr. GLOVER, by unanimous consent from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back a bill (H. R. No. 2524) for the relief of certain soldiers of the Eighth Cavalry of the Missouri State Militia, with amendments; which were referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## WILLIAM M. PLEAS AND F. S. JONES.

Mr. GLOVER also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, reported back a bill (H. R. No. 1057) for the relief of William M. Pleas and F. S. Jones, with amendments; which were referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

## O. E. BABCOCK.

Mr. GLOVER also, by unanimous consent, from the same committee, reported back copies of orders, letters, telegrams, &c., filed in the Adjutant-General's Office relating to the assembly on the business of the military court of inquiry called to inquire into the conduct of Colonel O. E. Babcock, and moved its reference to the Committee on Whisky Frauds; which motion was agreed to.

## BRIDGE OVER THE WABASH RIVER.

Mr. ATKINS. I now call for the regular order of business.

Mr. DUNNELL. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. ATKINS. I yield on condition that it gives rise to no debate.

Mr. DUNNELL. I ask leave to submit a report from the Committee on Commerce authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Wabash River. The bill is not lengthy, and will not take up much time.

Mr. ATKINS. If it is going to excite discussion, I must object.

Mr. DUNNELL. There will be no discussion on the bill. If there is I will withdraw it.

The bill was read.

Mr. DUNNELL. The second section of the bill is the section added to bills authorizing the construction of these bridges.

Mr. HOLMAN. I reserve objection to this bill for a moment until I state the grounds of my objection. I will state the grounds of my objection, and the gentleman can correct his bill in these particulars. The question as to the length of the span and height above high-water mark is not left to the Secretary of War.

Mr. ATKINS. If discussion is going to spring up, I object and call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection being made, the bill is not before the House.

Mr. DUNNELL. This is in harmony with bills already passed.

Mr. HOLMAN. We paid no attention to the Wabash until we began to spend large sums of money to improve its navigation, \$75,000 for the present year. I must insist that the Secretary of War shall

determine the width of the span and height above high-water mark, and also that any change required by the Secretary of War shall be at the expense of the company. As this bill may be reported by the Committee on Commerce, I ask that my amendments be included.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill is not before the House.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think the bill can be put in shape in a moment. The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Tennessee object?

Mr. ATKINS. If it is going to take up any time, I must object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair must have another answer if the gentleman insists on his objection.

Mr. ATKINS. The gentleman assured me that it would not give rise to any debate. I do not like to be discourteous, but I must insist on my objection.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill is not before the House.

## GENERAL DEBATE.

Mr. MORRISON. I am asked by gentlemen on the other side of the House to make the following request for unanimous consent.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the sessions of Wednesday and Thursday shall be devoted to the consideration of special orders now pending, and no vote be taken thereon or question determined on which a division shall be demanded.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Indiana. I object.

Mr. ATKINS. That practically dispenses with the consideration of the Army bill and the action of the House upon it?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It does not dispense with the consideration of the Army bill so far as general debate is concerned. But any action on this bill is dispensed with if this resolution be adopted. Is there objection?

Mr. ATKINS. I object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection being made, the proposition is not before the House.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ATKINS. I move that the rules be suspended and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. WALLING. I do not desire to antagonize this bill, but I would say to gentlemen who have charge of bills which committees are ready to report that if they expect to have them brought before the House the morning hour must be insisted on.

The motion of Mr. ATKINS was agreed to.

## ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. BLACKBURN in the chair,) and proceeded to consider the special order, being the bill (H. R. No. 3717) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Army appropriation bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WOOD] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WOOD, of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is the eleventh appropriation bill reported from the Committee on Appropriations during this session. It is the last except one of all of the regular appropriation bills usually passed by Congress. And when the remaining one shall have been presented, we will then have, in the language of the British House of Commons, the "budget" for the ensuing fiscal year. It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, a proper time for this House to take an observation, that we may know exactly where we stand with reference to the expenditures of the Government and the resources of the Government by which these expenditures shall be maintained.

I propose, sir, in the time that shall be allotted to me in this discussion to address myself more to the general question as to the expenditures and resources and the general condition of the country with reference to the public burdens than I shall attempt to enter into any discussion of the propositions contained in detail in the bill itself. I have given some reflection to this general question and have matured some thoughts directly bearing upon the resources of the Government as it stands at this time and as to its probable condition at the end of the next fiscal year; whether it is in default now of the estimates, and whether it will not be still more so this time next year. In this connection I shall refer somewhat in detail to the past extravagance of the Administration, the general tendency to undue expenditure, and the clear duty of this House in view of the professions and criticisms of the democratic party.

As preliminary to a consideration of this subject, I desire to call the attention of the House to the peculiarity of our past history and the leading developments of our national existence. Were I to write the history of this country for the century just closing, I would separate it into four great epochs, namely:

First, from 1776 to 1801, as that distinguished as the revolutionary era, the grand struggle for freedom from the British Crown, the formation of a confederated league, the adoption of the Constitution, and the creation of a more effective and united government, and the announcement of the true theory of republicanism, as developed in the system of Thomas Jefferson.

Second, from 1801 to 1826, for the final consummation of entire in-



dependence of England in the second war with that power, the gradual development of trade and commerce, and the settlement of certain grave questions of government finances and foreign policy, including the acquisition of Louisiana and Florida.

Third, from 1826 to 1851, for the further extension of territory in the additions of Texas and our Pacific possessions, the discovery and working of the gold and silver mines, and in the commencement of a brighter era, which, if rightly appreciated and directed, would have laid the foundation for a national prosperity in an enlarged material development in excess of anything in the history of this or any other people.

Fourth, from 1851 to 1876, for the humiliating exhibition of general financial and commercial intoxication, the most terrible civil war of any age, followed by public and private demoralization, the accession to power over the Government of a combination formed of the worst and the best but weakest elements of society, and the consequent introduction of extravagance, profligacy, and corruption in the management of public affairs and throughout the body-politic; the period of sensationalism, of pretense, of assumption, and of inferior and diluted intellects struggling with each other for the control of the Government, for the better advantage of each other. Such is the humiliating spectacle presented to the world by this truly great people, who in an evil hour have become untrue to their fathers and themselves.

Such, Mr. Chairman, is our position to-day. Such is our condition as a government, and such is our condition socially. In all our industrial and material interests we have, in common parlance, been living far beyond our resources; I mean our legitimate resources. The scale of expenditures has been largely in excess of our means. What were once thought to be mere luxuries have become necessities. Men who formerly could live upon \$2,500 a year now require \$5,000 and \$10,000 a year, and are not as comfortable, nor as happy, nor as upright as formerly upon that sum. Our Government, which during the war spent at one period \$1,500,000,000 a year, after war had ceased found it almost impossible to reduce those expenditures. The impure infusion into the Government would not come down to a peace basis. It was only by the bold and aggressive attitude of the minority in Congress that any material reductions were effected at all. But though reductions were made from the war scale of expenditures, look at the gradual increase effected notwithstanding. I print tables gathered from official data, which of themselves abundantly prove the successful efforts of the party in power to force back again the former enormous disbursements. I call the attention of the House and the country to the fruits of republican misrule as exemplified and illustrated in what is here presented.

I submit a comparative table of expenditures or appropriations for the public service, collated from reports of the Secretary of the Treasury and other official documents:

<i>Post-office expenditures.</i>	
1868.....	\$22,730,592 65
1869.....	23,698,131 50
1870.....	23,998,837 63
1871.....	24,390,104 05
1872.....	26,658,192 31
1873.....	29,084,945 67
1874.....	32,126,414 58
1875.....	33,611,309 45
	2,162,985,527 87
For year 1876 appropriated.....	37,524,361 00
Total.....	2,200,509,888 87

<i>Naval appropriations.</i>	
1868.....	16,288,244 00
1869.....	17,356,350 00
1870.....	18,453,270 00
1871.....	19,250,090 00
1872.....	19,832,323 00
1873.....	18,296,733 00
1874.....	*22,276,257 00
1875.....	20,813,946 00
	152,567,213 00

*Comparative receipts and expenditures of the Internal Revenue Department, collated from the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury.*

Year.	Receipts.	Cost of collection.	Per cent.
1867.....	\$266,027,537 43	\$7,892,050 98	3
1868.....	191,087,589 41	8,730,357 65	4½
1869.....	158,386,460 86	7,200,114 16	4½
1870.....	184,899,756 49	7,234,531 14	4
1871.....	143,089,153 63	7,075,187 14	5
1872.....	130,642,177 72	5,697,288 34	4
1873.....	113,729,314 14	5,337,124 23	4½
1874.....	102,409,784 90	4,573,086 89	4½
1875.....	110,007,493 58	5,188,513 31	4½
Total.....	1,400,288,268 16	58,928,253 84	

\* Of this sum four millions was appropriated for extraordinary expenses of the naval service.

<i>Expenditures on account of Indians.</i>	
1868.....	\$3,998,353 59
1869.....	6,927,773 48
1870.....	3,407,938 14
1871.....	7,426,997 44
1872.....	7,061,728 82
1873.....	7,951,704 88
1874.....	6,692,462 09
1875.....	8,384,656 82
Total.....	51,851,615 26

*The amounts appropriated to pay the expenses of the War Department for the years 1866 to 1876, inclusive.*

<i>For the fiscal year ending June 30—</i>	
1866.....	283,154,676 06
1867.....	95,224,415 63
1868.....	123,246,648 62
1869.....	78,501,990 61
1870.....	57,655,675 40
1871.....	35,799,991 82
1872.....	35,372,157 20
1873.....	46,323,138 31
1874.....	42,313,927 22
1875.....	41,120,645 98
1876.....	28,331,070 00
	867,044,336 85
Estimates for 1877.....	33,697,178 50
Making a grand total of.....	890,741,515 35

<i>Coast Survey expenditures.</i>	
1868.....	455,700 77
1869.....	478,410 72
1870.....	506,279 06
1871.....	735,000 00
1872.....	729,000 00
1873.....	852,828 75
1874.....	841,000 00
1875.....	780,635 44
Total.....	5,378,854 74

<i>Expenditures surveying public lands.</i>	
1868.....	373,252 30
1869.....	429,495 78
1870.....	641,497 37
1871.....	564,940 76
1872.....	838,514 96
1873.....	1,128,060 13
1874.....	1,271,193 15
1875.....	1,299,636 36
Total.....	6,546,590 81

<i>Expenditures surveyors-general's offices.</i>	
1868.....	95,209 75
1869.....	96,596 08
1870.....	114,962 89
1871.....	121,144 05
1872.....	557,359 95
1873.....	414,135 19
1874.....	735,524 86
1875.....	690,303 38
Total.....	2,825,236 15

<i>Judiciary expenditures.</i>	
1868.....	723,378 57
1869.....	2,357,661 94
1870.....	2,610,342 33
1871.....	3,320,918 98
1872.....	3,594,077 52
1873.....	3,826,131 77
1874.....	3,436,567 25
1875.....	3,704,309 90
Total.....	23,573,388 46

<i>United States mints and assay offices expenditures.</i>	
1873.....	762,182 00
1874.....	1,267,147 68
1875.....	1,408,846 41
Total.....	3,438,176 09

<i>Sub-treasuries expenditures.</i>	
1868.....	260,113 88
1869.....	272,614 27
1870.....	305,075 06
1871.....	324,074 73
1872.....	430,835 82
1873.....	493,660 90
1874.....	549,477 50
1875.....	460,379 77
Total.....	3,096,231 93

<i>Miscellaneous expenditures.</i>	
1868.....	53,009,867 67
1869.....	56,474,061 53
1870.....	53,237,461 56
1871.....	60,481,916 23
1872.....	60,984,757 42
1873.....	73,328,110 06
1874.....	*85,141,593 61
1875.....	71,070,702 98
Total.....	513,728,471 06

\* In this amount is included \$15,500,000 expended under Geneva award.

Summary and comparative statement of expenditures or appropriations in the several branches of the public service named in the fiscal years, respectively, as follows:

Branch of service.	1868.	1869.	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.	1875.	Remarks.
Post-Office .....	\$22,730,592 00	\$23,698,131 50	\$23,998,837 63	\$24,390,104 08	\$26,658,192 31	\$29,084,944 00	\$32,126,414 58	\$33,611,309 45	Expenditures.
Indians .....	3,988,353 00	6,927,773 48	3,407,938 14	7,426,997 44	7,061,728 82	7,951,704 00	6,692,462 09	8,384,656 82	Do.
War .....	123,246,548 00	78,501,990 61	57,655,676 40	35,799,491 82	35,372,157 20	46,323,138 00	42,313,927 22	51,190,645 98	Appropriations
Naval .....	16,288,244 00	17,356,350 00	18,453,270 00	19,250,090 00	19,832,323 00	18,296,733 00	22,276,257 00	20,813,946 00	Do.
Coast Survey .....	453,700 00	478,410 72	506,279 06	735,000 00	729,000 00	832,828 75	841,000 00	780,635 44	Expenditures.
Survey of public lands .....	373,252 30	429,495 78	641,497 37	564,940 76	838,514 96	1,128,060 00	1,271,193 15	1,299,636 36	Do.
Surveyors-General's Offices .....	95,309 00	96,596 08	114,969 89	121,144 05	557,359 95	414,135 00	735,524 86	690,303 38	Do.
Judiciary .....	723,378 00	2,357,661 94	2,610,342 53	3,330,918 98	3,594,077 52	3,826,131 00	3,436,567 25	3,704,309 90	Do.
Subtreasury .....	260,113 00	272,614 27	305,075 06	324,074 73	430,835 82	493,661 00	549,477 50	460,379 77	Do.
Miscellaneous .....	53,009,867 00	56,474,061 53	53,237,461 56	60,481,916 23	60,984,757 42	73,328,110 00	85,141,593 61	71,070,792 98	Do.

Nor is this general increase in expenditures the only proof of extravagance, to call it by the mildest phrase, of the Government under the present party. The increase in the civil list furnishes additional evidence if it were required. I ask a careful examination of the following table as exhibiting the fact that a larger number of employes have been borne upon the pay-rolls since the war than during the war. Certainly the object must have been for other purposes than to conduct merely official duties. It is not uncharitable to conclude that this horde of paid dependents was in the main but auxiliary to the general working of the political machine, devoted more to the continuance of the ruling power than to the public weal.

Statement of the number of employes borne upon the civil list of the United States from 1859 to 1875, inclusive, compiled from the Biennial Registers.

Departments.	1859.			1861.			1863.			1865.			1867.			1869.			1871.			1873.			1875.
	At Washington.	Elsewhere.	Total.	At Washington.	Elsewhere.	Total.	At Washington.	Elsewhere.	Total.	At Washington.	Elsewhere.	Total.	At Washington.	Elsewhere.	Total.	At Washington.	Elsewhere.	Total.	At Washington.	Elsewhere.	Total.	At Washington.	Elsewhere.	Total.	
State .....	34	339	373	33	366	399	34	374	408	37	398	435	39	434	473	47	528	575	57	387	444	63	401	464	460
Treasury .....	457	3,295	3,752	494	2,697	3,191	1,103	3,721	4,824	2,067	4,176	6,243	2,529	5,582	8,111	2,451	5,631	8,082	2,543	6,050	8,593	2,000	8,630	11,430	11,316
Interior .....	607	691	1,298	875	610	1,485	829	634	1,463	924	583	1,507	774	984	1,758	1,322	849	2,171	1,452	1,412	2,864	1,590	1,991	3,581	2,750
War .....	90	246	336	120	703	823	670	749	1,419	924	2,379	3,303	1,645	1,023	2,668	644	692	1,336	564	968	1,532	584	1,082	1,666	1,720
Navy .....	73	19	92	81	17	98	115	23	138	118	23	141	115	48	163	80	93	173	111	90	201	119	8,192	8,241	10,105
Justice .....	6	206	212	8	268	276	9	204	213	9	212	221	11	219	230	41	198	239	44	260	304	47	681	728	
Post-Office .....	101	38,193	38,294	107	39,506	39,613	160	38,574	38,734	173	40,971	41,144	234	42,189	42,423	289	41,037	41,346	426	42,925	43,351	495	59,730	60,225	65,726
Legislative .....	140	.....	140	164	.....	164	176	.....	176	173	.....	173	287	.....	287	285	.....	285	316	.....	316	325	.....	325	314
Total .....	1,538	42,969	44,527	1,882	44,167	46,049	3,096	44,279	47,375	4,435	48,742	53,167	5,634	50,479	56,113	5,159	49,048	54,207	5,513	52,092	57,605	6,023	60,637	86,660	94,119

In view of these facts, the question presents itself should the people of the United States bear this burden, even if they were able to do so? Admit that our material interests were in a condition of great prosperity; admit that we were where we were a few years ago, when all of us were doing well and making money, and many of us saving something besides our expenditures. I submit, that however wealthy the people may be it is not necessary that so large a number of officials should be employed for governmental purposes, or that such a large expenditure of money should be incurred. I believe it is demonstrable that our Government can be maintained efficiently, the public interest better preserved and protected by a reduction of at least 35 to 40 per cent. in the number of employes and in the general disbursements.

But are the people able to bear their large burdens at this time even if the present scale of expenditures are necessary? What is the present condition of the Treasury? For this is a pertinent and indeed a vital question we should ask ourselves in this connection.

A government, like an individual, should live within its means. If in either case the cost of living is in excess of the income, the deficit must be provided for in some way, either by levying contributions upon others, by borrowing, or by retrenchment. I have ascertained from the best available official sources the present condition of the Treasury at this time, the end of the present fiscal year. My data is entirely reliable if we can place confidence in the official statements of those who have the immediate charge of the Treasury.

Statement of condition of the Treasury, June 30, 1876.

The estimate of receipts for the present year (see report of Secretary of the Treasury, 1875, page vi) was .....	\$297,456,145 14
The actual receipts for eleven months and estimate for the present month is officially stated .....	286,247,387 76
Difference between estimates and receipts .....	11,208,757 38
The expenditures for same period was estimated (report of Secretary of the Treasury, page vi) at .....	268,447,543 76
Actual expenditures for eleven months and estimate for present month, as officially stated, not including sinking fund .....	263,138,853 53
.....	5,308,690 23
Add to this the balance due the sinking fund, after deducting \$13,000,000, the only bonds called for this year .....	\$32,293,692 32
.....	13,000,000 00
.....	19,293,692 32
Deficiency at end of present fiscal year .....	24,602,382 55

NOTE.—The retired legal-tender and fractional currency redeemed are no part of the sinking fund under the act of February 25, 1862.

Estimated condition of the Treasury for 1877.

Estimated expenditures, (see report of Secretary of the Treasury, December 6, 1875, page vi) .....	\$369,265,000 00
Add to this sinking fund, (see report of Secretary of the Treasury, page vii) .....	34,063,377 40
Total .....	303,328,377 40
To this add deficiency for 1876 .....	24,602,382 55
Total to be provided for .....	327,930,759 95
To provide for this take same total receipts as the present year .....	286,247,387 76
Probable deficiency at end of fiscal year 1877 .....	41,683,372 19

In these statements it will be observed that the required contribution to the sinking fund is provided for. Though it is my belief that the Government is not indebted to this fund at all, owing to the large purchases by Mr. BOUTWELL when Secretary of the Treasury of outstanding bonds, yet in view of the positively expressed intention of Mr. Bristow in his last annual report of adhering strictly to the requirement of the law which sets apart a portion of the coin receipts as a special fund for this object, I do not see why it should not be included as one of the obligations of the Government. To consider the legal-tenders and fractional currency redeemed under recent acts of Congress as complying with the law of 1862 as proper appropriation to this fund is, in my opinion, an evasion of the clearly expressed determination of the Secretary in his report to Congress referring to this subject. The sinking-fund account, therefore, stands thus:

Sinking-fund account, (official,) 1875 and 1876.

For 1875:	
Due .....	\$31,096,545
Applied .....	25,170,400
Balance due .....	5,926,145
For 1876:	
Due .....	\$32,140,914
Applied .....	13,000,000
Balance due .....	19,140,914
Now due .....	25,067,053

(See report Secretary of the Treasury, December, 1876, pages x and xi.)

Such is the condition of the public finances. It is obvious the Government cannot bear the burden which has been imposed upon it in the appropriations, in view of its decreased and decreasing resources.

Further taxation is out of the question at this time, and should not be resorted to even if practicable. There is but one honest course left, and that lies in a general, radical change in the scale of official expenditure. This is our duty if we are true to those we represent, and the special mission of this House.

Our legislative system was modeled after the English system. England has her House of Lords, corresponding with our Senate; her House of Commons, corresponding with our House of Representatives. The government of England is no longer in the Crown, nor in the peers of the realm; it is in the people as represented in the House of Commons. So the Government of the United States is to-day, or ought to be, in the people; and so far as we here are faithful to the interests and liberties and rights of the people, here should be the power of the Government in controlling everything relating to the question of expenditures. Sir, the House of Commons fixes the budget; no House of Lords ever dared to make an issue with the House of Commons as to expenditures of the public money. The House of Lords does not amend a money bill coming from the House of Commons. The chancellor of the exchequer opens his budget; he presents to the House of Commons what, in his judgment, are the necessities of the government; he presents a detailed statement of the resources of the government; he makes his recommendation; the ministry support his recommendations, and the House of Commons vote upon it. Sometimes they modify, alter, and amend materially, but generally in the line of decrease, although I have known instances where the budget has been materially increased by the action of the House of Commons as against the ministry. Whatever that determination may be, when that budget is transmitted from the House of Commons to the House of Lords, it is adopted almost always *nem. con.* as a finality. Not so here, sir; and I hope my apprehension may not be realized that our house of lords will make issue with us at this time as to our budget on the question of economy. But if that issue shall come, I hope we will go before the people on it and let that court of final resort judge between us.

What has our Committee on Appropriations done? I said at the beginning of these remarks that our budget was nearly closed. The Committee on Appropriations has reported to the House the eleventh general appropriation bill. There remains but one more, and when that bill shall have been reported to the House we will have the entire amount of expenditure which the House of Representatives, so far as I know and believe, intend to allow for carrying on the Government during the next fiscal year.

I cannot say that I justify every detailed item of expenditure presented in these bills. I took exception originally to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill as reported from the Committee on Appropriations. I had grave doubts about the abolition of several consularships which under existing law certified to invoices of merchandise and had a material influence on the amount of duties to be collected under the *ad-valorem* system. I had my fears that the revenues of the country would be affected by the abolition of those consulates, and I looked upon the trifling expense involved in keeping them up as of little consequence compared with what, in my judgment, were larger and graver national considerations. I could go on and show particular items in other bills, isolated propositions, which of and by themselves I might have some doubts about, but the whole purpose, scope, and theory upon which these reductions of public expenditure have been made are in my judgment politic and wise, and we have no duty here on this side of the House except to stand by them as the declaration of a principle, as a practical, ever-living illustration of the truth of our professions to the people of economy and reform.

Now let us see what the Committee on Appropriations and this House propose in the way of reductions. It is well occasionally, and especially at this time, to take "an observation," in marine language, of the exact situation of the ship of state and how this House proposes to meet the existing deficiency in the revenues of the Government. I present a concise statement relating to each of the appropriation bills as reported from the committee, as acted upon by the House, and as compared with the estimates and the appropriations made by the last Congress for the same service:

*Situation of the following-named bills, June 13, 1876.*

<b>Military Academy, reported January 11:</b>	
Estimates, (see Book of Estimates, pages 70, 75, 76, 77, and 134) .....	\$437, 470 00
Committee recommended .....	231, 241 00
Reduction .....	206, 229 00
Appropriation for present year .....	364, 740 00
Reduction .....	133, 499 00
In conference committee.	
Passed the House January 31.	
<b>Pension bill, reported January 11:</b>	
Same as estimates .....	29, 533, 500 00
Appropriation for present year .....	30, 000, 000 00
Reduction .....	466, 500 00
Has become a law as passed House.	
<b>Consular and diplomatic bill, reported January 28:</b>	
Estimates, (see Book of Estimates, pages 61, &c.) .....	1, 352, 485 00
Committee recommended .....	922, 847 50
Reduction .....	429, 637 50
Appropriation for present year .....	1, 351, 285 00
Reduction .....	428, 437 50
Conference committee re-appointed by the House.	
Passed the House April 10.	

<b>Fortification bill, including torpedoes and armaments, reported February 15:</b>	
Estimates, (see Book of Estimates, pages 73, 74, 83, and 126) .....	\$3, 406, 000 00
Committee recommended .....	315, 000 00
Reduction .....	3, 091, 000 00
Appropriation for present year .....	850, 000 00
Reduction .....	535, 000 00
Has become a law.	
<b>Legislative, executive, and judicial, reported March 8:</b>	
Estimates, (see Book of Estimates, pages 9a, 32, 34a, 50, 51a, and 58) .....	20, 836, 307 00
Committee recommended .....	13, 009, 807 61
Reduction .....	7, 826, 499 39
Appropriation for present year .....	18, 734, 225 00
Reduction .....	5, 724, 417 39
Returned to the Senate with nine hundred and fifty-two amendments non-concurred in .....	
Passed the House April 28.	
<b>River and harbor bill, reported April 3:</b>	
Estimates, (see Book of Estimates, pages 127 <i>et seq.</i> ) .....	14, 301, 100 00
Committee recommended .....	5, 872, 850 00
Reduction .....	8, 428, 250 00
Appropriation for present year .....	6, 643, 517 50
Reduction .....	770, 667 50
Passed the House April 10.	
In the Committee on Commerce, Senate.	
<b>Deficiency bill, reported April 11:</b>	
Estimate, (see Executive Document No. 155, Forty-fourth Congress, first session) .....	2, 723, 471 70
Committee recommended .....	662, 315 07
Reduction .....	2, 061, 156 63
Appropriation for last year .....	4, 703, 699 18
Reduction .....	4, 041, 384 11
Has become a law.	
<b>Post-office bill, reported April 29:</b>	
Estimates, (see Book of Estimates, page 141) .....	37, 939, 805 99
Committee recommended .....	32, 189, 109 00
Reduction .....	5, 750, 696 99
Appropriation for present year .....	37, 524, 361 00
Reduction .....	5, 335, 252 00
Returned to Senate with non-concurrence of House .....	
Passed the House May 17.	
<b>Navy bill, reported May 5:</b>	
Estimates, (see Book of Estimates, pages 816 <i>et seq.</i> ) .....	20, 871, 666 40
Committee recommended .....	12, 808, 655 40
Reduction .....	8, 063, 011 00
Appropriation for present year .....	17, 011, 306 90
Reduction .....	4, 202, 651 50
In the Senate committee.	
Passed the House May 23.	
<b>Indian bill, reported May 18:</b>	
Estimates, (see Book of Estimates, pages 91, <i>et seq.</i> ) .....	5, 787, 995 64
Recommended by committee .....	3, 905, 771 27
Reduction .....	1, 882, 224 37
Appropriation for present year .....	5, 360, 554 55
Reduction .....	1, 454, 783 28
In the Senate committee.	
Summary showing reductions on the several bills as reported from estimates:	
Military Academy .....	206, 229 00
Consular and diplomatic .....	429, 637 50
Fortifications, including torpedoes, &c. ....	3, 091, 000 00
Deficiency .....	2, 061, 156 63
Legislative, executive, and judicial .....	7, 826, 499 89
Rivers and harbors .....	8, 428, 250 00
Post-office .....	5, 750, 696 99
Naval service .....	8, 063, 011 00
Indian service .....	1, 882, 224 37
Amount carried to page 5 .....	37, 738, 705 38
From appropriations for present year:	
Military Academy .....	133, 499 00
Consular and diplomatic .....	428, 437 50
Fortifications, including torpedoes, &c. ....	535, 000 00
Deficiency .....	4, 041, 384 11
Legislative, executive, and judicial .....	5, 724, 417 39
Rivers and harbors .....	770, 667 50
Post-office .....	5, 335, 000 00
Naval service .....	4, 202, 651 50
Indian service .....	1, 454, 783 28
Amount carried to page 5 .....	22, 625, 840 28

Army bill, reported June 12, 1876:	
Estimates, (see Book of Estimates, pages 67 and 77, inclusive).....	\$33,348,708 50
Recommended .....	23,254,477 12
Reduction .....	10,094,231 38
Amount appropriated for present year .....	27,933,380 00
Reduction .....	4,678,902 88
Reduction from estimates:	
Amount brought forward from page 4 .....	37,738,705 38
Reduction from estimates in Army bill .....	10,094,231 38
	47,832,936 76
Reduction from last year's appropriation brought forward from page 4 .....	22,625,840 38
Reduction from last year's appropriation of Army bill .....	4,678,902 88
	27,304,743 16

## SUMMARY.

The pension, fortification, and deficiency bills have become laws.	
The consular and diplomatic and Military Academy bills are with conference committees.	
The legislative, river and harbor, and post-office bills are before committees by reference of the Senate.	
The naval bill has gone to the Senate committee.	
The Indian bill is before the Senate committee.	
The sundry civil bill is with the Committee on Appropriations, shortly to be reported to the House.	
The Army bill is before the House.	
The reduction made in the ten bills, as set forth in the foregoing pages, below the estimates amounts to .....	
Add to this the probable reduction on the two remaining bills, (Army and sundry civil,) say .....	\$37,738,705 38
	20,000,000 00
Total as reduced below estimates .....	57,000,000 00
The reduction below the amounts appropriated for the present year .....	22,625,840 38
Add to this the probable reduction on the two remaining bills .....	17,000,000 00
Total as reduced below appropriation for this year .....	39,000,000 00

In this way this House proposes to meet the deficiency. We believe it is necessary to meet that deficiency, not by borrowing, not by increase of taxation of the people, but simply by retrenchment. We think that reduction can be made without injury to the public service. We think the Government can be efficiently conducted with a very large reduction in each of the several branches; and I think I represent every gentleman upon this side of the House when I state that we have no disposition to embarrass the Administration. We do not wish to withhold a single dollar where that dollar is required for actual value rendered to the people who contribute that dollar, but we are resolved to make every effort to reduce the expenditures of the Government. Whether we will succeed or not, we must make the effort. While here and there there may be an item that might probably have been a little different, yet I take the ground that an aggregate reduction of over \$40,000,000, which I have stated in detail, can be made and ought to be made for the relief of the people.

I believe, sir, from my experience and somewhat intimate knowledge of public affairs, that the machine might be run just as well, even better, by a more simple process at much less expense than this grand and magnificent affair that we now have, with its varied ramifications reaching every township and every voter of the country, and exercising an influence upon him in contradistinction to the true theory of self-government and the right of free opinion.

## MILITARY POWER ANTAGONISTIC TO CIVIL POWER.

Now, with reference to the Army, my position and belief are, Mr. Chairman, republics have no necessity for standing armies. These institutions are inconsistent with the nature and theory of free opinion. The military power is one of force; it belongs to arbitrary rule. The civil power is one of thought; it belongs to the government of popular liberty, uncontrolled and untrammelled by other considerations than public good, as determined by the will of the people. Under our system the military is, or should be, subservient to the civil authority. The Army, as such, and those who control it, have no rights or privileges not accorded by the law, which itself is but the emanation of the people's voice.

And yet the military have never relaxed its effort to command a supreme power. Though not in fact even a necessary feature of government, it has always essayed not only to be permanently fixed as one but to be paramount to all others. In this country the War Department should have no existence except in time of war. It is not a requisite branch of the Government, as is generally conceded. It performs none of the legitimate functions of our Government in time of peace. It is inappropriate to such a period, having no uses, no duties, no affinity, or sympathy with the workings of a political institution founded on free opinion. It aids not in the execution of the laws, being foreign to the execution of any of the duties imposed upon the President. In time of peace neither the conduct of our relations with other governments nor the postal nor the internal nor the fiscal nor the judicial divisions of authority require the support of the military in the performance of the several duties devolving upon them.

For purposes of the protection of the merchant marine, a small naval force may be required; but, outside of a few cavalry upon the frontier and border settlements, I know of no necessity for military in the performance of the legitimate and proper functions of this Government.

Switzerland, our transatlantic sister-republic, has no war department and no standing army. She has no government troops, and needs none. If an emergency arises when an army is required, she draws upon the cantons (corresponding with our States) for their armed contributions, according to their population and means of furnishing them. I think it worthy of serious consideration whether we could not learn from their example and reform and re-organize our military system upon some such economical and simple plan. The arguments based upon the necessity for always being prepared for war in time of peace, and hence the reason for always maintaining an army, can have no force after the wonderful facility with which the Union forces were improvised, increased, and maintained in 1861, 1862, 1863, and 1864. From a few thousand men, all told, at the beginning of the late civil war the world witnessed with intense interest the creation, as it were, within a month of one of the largest and best-equipped military forces ever gathered together upon a field of battle.

What has been done once in this country can be done again. If our people, who are by temperament and education of all others the best fitted naturally for soldiers, could thus so suddenly change their characters from civilians to warriors to suppress a domestic insurrection, with how much greater alacrity would they not mass themselves to meet a foreign enemy. We do not need the paraphernalia of war in times of peace, certainly not when the expense of its maintenance imposes so heavy a burden. Therefore, I am in favor of the reductions provided for in this bill. I voted for the bills recently passed by the House for a further re-organization and consolidation of this branch of the service. I am disposed to go yet further by abolishing the War Department as a Department of the Government and transferring the duties, under very greatly restricted regulations, to the Department of the Interior, as one of the bureaus of that Department. But as it is not likely so radical a change could be effected under existing circumstances, it appears to me even yet greater reforms can be made than has as yet been proposed.

The chief work of reform must be on the great establishments, because they are in excess of the public needs. The Army is too large. The cost of it is greater than the country can bear, with all the other burdens. It is high time the Army was put on the proper basis of a peace establishment, suited to a Republic whose aim, both at the first and now, was and is to relieve the people from oppressive and expensive government. Our doctrine, as Mr. Jefferson put it, ought to be settled by this time, "not to take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned," especially now when every industry of the country is suffering and prostrate, mainly, as wise men believe, from public debt and taxation.

Heretofore, in regard to a standing Army, we have held to republican principles. After the first war, which placed a free Republic among the nations, we disbanded the Army we had no longer need for. After the war of 1812 we maintained little more than the nucleus of a military establishment. Since the civil war we do not revert to republican practice. We do not relieve, as we might, the burdens of the people. The great debt of the war is and was larger than any nation ever accumulated in the same time. The great cost of the pension list, of the retired list, of the invalid soldiers worn out in public service, all that must be borne. But the standing Army, for active service after the war, ought to be no greater than is useful and necessary, and we ought to consider the proper use we have for it. We have not the use monarchies have for standing armies, to make war on our neighbors or to govern and oppress our people. In civil administration free government is all we need. We have no good use for soldiers to regulate popular elections, to organize legislatures, to administer laws. The only use we have for soldiers at all is to serve as a nucleus for organization and a protection for the Indian frontier. For this last, we need as little or less than twenty-five years ago. We have now industrious, prosperous, well-governed States, where then we had but frontier settlements. The Indian tribes are weaker, more peaceful, submissive. Railroads and improved communications give the means of moving troops for frontier police and give greatly increased effect to the same force. For frontier use and defense ten thousand men would seem sufficient. For the other uses of a standing Army, for military science and preparation, the Military Academy and a complete and well-instructed staff are sufficient, with the skill in arms, the intelligence, and warlike temper of our people.

Assuming these principles, the application of them is not difficult. First. What need is there in peace for sea-coast garrisons? Fort-keepers under engineers would save the expense and take better care of the works. Two regiments of artillery are now employed for that purpose in New York and New England, two more from Baltimore to Pensacola. Those four regiments may be useful elsewhere; if not, they furnish occasion of a great retrenchment and an excellent economy.

Second. Worse than useless, very mischievous, are the garrisons and troops posted in the Southern States. Those reconstructed States, admitted to their place in the Federal Government, have State governments sufficient to their domestic tranquillity.

The soldier is no part of the republican institution for that work, and if employed in it is liable to misconceive his use and function; to conceive, like Sheridan, that he is to deal with the people as banditti. For the peace and good government of the country, and of

the Southern States especially, as States of this Union, whose prosperity and wealth are part of ours, the soldiers there ought to be taken away and they ought to be disbanded; certainly they are not wanted there, even if they were as subordinate to the civil authority as the Constitution declares they shall be; even if their commanders had the dutiful respect and reverence for law that animated Washington and Jackson and Hancock.

If our Government is reconstructed; if we are the republic we were; if the methods of free government and legal administration are sufficient to us now, as before the war, we have no use for a larger standing army now than then. Some facts of detail may be suggested. Before the war the Army was about twelve thousand men, now it is twenty thousand. The cost then was fifteen millions a year; last year it was over forty-one millions. Look, too, at the list of officers; when the soldier is let go, the officer often continues to hold on under the plea of "organization," and of keeping on hand a proper amount of the "science of war." Our General and Lieutenant-General have held on, though admitted by the law to be useless and allowed "until a vacancy and no longer;" so says the act of 1870. This is a concession in the way of pension. Besides, there is the expense, with all the machinery of staff and headquarters. The official report of this expense is not quite explicit.

The General's salary is put at \$13,500, with 40 per cent. added for service. House rent, fuel, and forage added to the 40 per cent. must run it up over \$20,000. His aids, colonels, at \$3,500 to \$4,500 salary each, with fuel, quarters, forage for each, and cost of headquarters in cities, and clerks, make at least \$30,000 more, or \$50,000 in all. The Lieutenant-General and all his machinery must be put at least \$30,000; say \$80,000 per year for the two officers, for and during the incumbents. These officers, until a vacancy, are to "command the armies of the United States." The Constitution imposes this duty upon the President and no one else. That style and authority may do in war and with armies in the field. It is absurd in peace. Then, in every nation, the executive head of the nation, by a minister of war or government department, with subordinate bureaus, controls and directs the military administration—a function of government in peace. The General and Lieutenant-General, with headquarters in distant cities, are mere circumscription and obstructions to the regular administration from the seat of Government.

Much rank in peace is bad provision for war. The ablest administrator among Napoleon's great soldiers has told of the incumbrance he found in his earlier wars. Even his all-controlling hand could not restrain their jealousies, vanity, and contention.

The list of generals is too large. There were four before the war, there are now eleven. The staff corps has accumulated largely in numbers and rank. The adjutant-generals have gone up from fourteen to seventeen, the judge advocates from one to ten, the inspectors from two to eight, the quartermasters from thirty-seven to forty-eight, the commissaries from twelve to twenty-six, the doctors from one hundred and fifteen to one hundred and eighty-seven, the paymasters from twenty-eight to fifty-three, the engineers from ninety-one to one hundred and nine, the ordnance from thirty-four to fifty-three. There appears on the Army list twenty-eight chaplains; they may be useful in peace and war, but can be reduced fully one-half.

Am I not right, therefore, in asking an abolition of the whole system, or a material modification of it?

"The pomp and circumstance of glorious war" is as antagonistic to free government, founded on popular opinion, in time of peace as it is too expensive to be borne. Therefore, for these reasons, I am in favor of a general reduction of expenditures, a re-organization of the entire governmental routine, and a re-adaptation of the executive machine to the pure, cheap, and simple plan upon which it was constructed by our fathers. Why should all this splendid extravagance and immense array of the *personnel* of the official list be maintained any longer? I know how hard it is to reduce expenses once created and continued for a while, but the people have had to do so in their individual case, and I know no reason why the Government should not do so likewise.

Let this House, the popular branch of Congress, and which represents the great democratic party of the country, stand firm in its economy; and if the Senate, which, representing the republican party, chooses to place itself in a hostile attitude to this so much needed reform, the issue will be fairly joined, and we shall go before the people as the court of last resort to determine between us. I have no fear of the result.

A cause so just cannot fail, and we shall recover once more the possession of the people's power, to be used in their interest and for their welfare.

During the delivery of Mr. Wood's remarks his time was extended, on motion of Mr. TUCKER, and the following proceedings took place:

Mr. ATKINS. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOOD] allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. WOOD, of New York. Certainly.

Mr. ATKINS. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that a good many gentlemen desire to speak upon this bill. They cannot all speak to-day, and I believe it is agreeable to the Committee on Appropriations that the general discussion shall run both to-day and to-morrow, and that the next day we will take up the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. KASSON. So that no business shall be transacted to-day or to-morrow?

The CHAIRMAN. Unless there be objection the Chair will regard that as the unanimous order of the committee.

Mr. ATKINS. On Friday morning I expect to explain the different sections of the bill, and may require rather more than five minutes to do so.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. We cannot make that order in Committee of the Whole. If it is necessary to make the order at all, the committee must rise and the proposition be made in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOOD] yield for a motion that the committee rise.

Mr. WOOD, of New York. I will yield providing I do not lose any of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time will not be taken from the hour of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Then I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. RANDALL having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. BLACKBURN reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 3717) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. ATKINS. I move that to-day and to-morrow be appropriated to the general discussion of the Army appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the understanding be that to-day and to-morrow be devoted to general discussion upon the Army appropriation bill in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. REAGAN. Will that exclude us from making reports in the morning hour?

Mr. ATKINS. My motion is that general debate shall run to-day and to-morrow.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The suggestion is that the sessions of to-day and to-morrow be devoted to general debate on the Army appropriation bill, and that no vote shall be taken on any proposition pending.

Mr. REAGAN. Let me ask the gentleman from Tennessee to modify that proposition so as to allow us to make reports in the morning hour.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The very object of the gentleman from Tennessee is to avoid reports from committees and votes thereon during the morning hour which could be done otherwise than by this agreement.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Will that exclude the Committee on Foreign Affairs from reporting?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair decides that it will exclude everything.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Does it require unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It does.

Mr. JONES, of Kentucky. Does it exclude the morning hour entirely?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It does.

Mr. ATKINS. Gentlemen know that the House is not full, and there would probably be no quorum here.

No objection being made, the understanding proposed by Mr. ATKINS was agreed to.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union on the Army appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. BLACKBURN in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 3717) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOOD, of New York, then resumed and concluded his remarks.

#### THE SOUTHERN QUESTION.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the pending bill, but as the Army has a direct bearing upon southern affairs, I did not think it would be inappropriate for me to take advantage of this occasion to discuss in a general way what is commonly called "the southern question." It is a source of deep regret to me that this is still the most important question agitating the public mind. It is important, because it was out of the discussion of this question that sprang up some of the most serious political troubles that have occurred in this country since the organization of the Government. It is important, inasmuch as it was the immediate cause of the recent civil war, which cost the country many millions of dollars and thousands of lives. It is important, because the results of the late war were supposed to have been made secure under the system of reconstruction that was finally adopted.

In discussing this subject, I desire to have it understood that I speak not as a casual observer of passing events, but from thorough practical knowledge. It is a subject with which I am not only familiar in consequence of my identity with southern people and southern interests, as I understand them, but it is one which has occupied no little portion of my most serious consideration. The spirit of my re-

marks I hope will be such as will satisfy the House and the country that I am entirely free from passion and prejudice. Having been born upon southern soil and raised under the influences of southern society, it is nothing more than reasonable to suppose that I would have a very strong attachment for its people, even though I could not as much as respect some of its peculiar institutions. The peculiar relation which I occupy toward a large class of white citizens in my State makes it a source of deep regret to me to give utterance to some things which nothing but a sense of public duty would cause me to utter. But believing as I do that the best and truest friend that any people can have is the friend that will tell them of their faults as well as of their virtues, I shall proceed to discharge what I believe to be a plain duty, regardless of consequences personal to myself.

It is not my purpose to speak with a view of advancing the interest of the republican party, except so far as its interest may be advanced by the truth of history impartially told. It is a fact well known by those who are familiar with my public career thus far that I am not one of that number, if there be such, who are anxious that the republican party at the South or elsewhere should retain or regain its ascendancy more in consequence of the demerits of others than any merit it may possess itself. I hope to see the day come when public opinion will be such that no party can be successful in the Government or in any State of this Union unless it deserves success. Although the republican party is not as free from faults as it should be, yet its claim upon the gratitude and support of the American people is sufficiently strong, in my judgment, to commend it to their approbation upon its own merits, and not as the least of two admitted evils. As anxious as I am that this great party shall remain in the ascendancy in the Government, yet if I could be induced to believe that this ascendancy can only be made an accomplished fact at the expense of good government, friendly and amicable relations between the different elements of which southern society is composed, and that democratic ascendancy would bring about the opposite result, then I would be willing to at least try the experiment of a change. But I am thoroughly convinced that republican ascendancy in the Government is not the cause of political troubles at the South, and that democratic ascendancy is not the remedy for the evils thus complained of.

Nor am I one of that number, if there be such, who take pleasure in referring to political troubles at the South with a view of controlling public opinion at the North. It would be to me a source of personal pride and congratulation if I could declare upon the floor of the House of Representatives to-day that mob-law and violence do not exist in any part of the South and are not tolerated by any portion of its citizens. That circumstances are such that the facts would not sustain me in making this declaration is to me a source of deep mortification and profound regret. If the political troubles at the South were not unusual and exceptional, and were such as are common on excitable and extraordinary occasions, and would be just as likely to occur in one section of the country as in the other, for the purpose of preserving the good name of the people whom I have the honor in part to represent, as well as the section of country from which I come, I would cover them over with the mantle of charity rather than expose them to the public gaze.

The chief cause of political troubles at the South, in my judgment, is, as I have said on a former occasion, the result of the existence of a public sentiment which renders it necessary for the masses of the two races to identify themselves with two different political organizations and thus bring themselves into an apparent, if not real, antagonism with each other. Every sensible man must admit that, if, in any government, State, or community the material elements composing the society of which consist of different races, nationalities, and religions, political parties should be organized upon the basis of race, nationality, or religion, the result will be disastrous, not only to the parties to such a contest, but also to the entire community where such organizations may exist. It was certainly not the intention of the original advocates of the system of reconstruction that was finally adopted to make race or color the basis of political organizations at the South, but they evidently believed and were justified in believing that the incorporation of the colored element into the body-politic was not only essential to secure to the Government the fruits of its victory upon the field of battle, but that a combination of the Union and liberal element among the whites with that of the colored would be most certain to follow.

That the anticipations of those who thus believed have not been fully realized presents to the American people questions which demand the most serious attention and careful consideration of the statesmen of to-day. The causes that have conspired to prevent a realization of these anticipations and to keep up race organizations at the South are questions which I propose briefly to touch upon at this time.

There are in brief just two causes that have brought about this result: First, the continuous and unnecessary opposition of the Bourbon or impracticable element inside of the ranks of the democracy to the system of reconstruction that was finally adopted by Congress and a stubborn refusal to willingly and cheerfully acquiesce in the results of the war, (and this element has unfortunately controlled the democratic organization and shaped its policy;) second, the persistent and uncharitable opposition of the same element to the civil and political rights of the colored people.

I now ask the careful attention of the House while I enlarge somewhat upon these two points. I admit that the unconditional enfranchisement of the colored men at the South may have been brought about as much from necessity as from choice; yet, as I said before, no other plan, in my judgment, would have secured to the Government the fruits of its victory upon the battle-field. The success of the Johnson plan of reconstruction would not only have placed the colored man in a condition worse than abject slavery, but it would have restored to power and position in the Government the very class of men who inaugurated the rebellion and brought on the war. The loyal people of the nation saw the danger, and the cry came up from one end of the country to the other, "Give the colored man the ballot."

The colored was the only material element at the South that the country could depend upon. Although the masses of them were known to be ignorant, yet it was also known that they were true to their Government. Whatever else may be said of the colored man, it can never be truthfully said of him that he was ever disloyal to his Government or ungrateful to his friends, in consequence of which I feel justified in appealing to the generous heart of the American people. Condemn not the colored man for his unintentional mistakes when he has stood by you so firmly in the hour of need.

I see nothing in the congressional plan of reconstruction to condemn. The fact that the South is in an unsettled condition to-day is not the result of the adoption of that policy, but the fault is in the people of that section. The same conduct on their part would produce precisely the same results under any system. If the congressional plan of reconstruction is a failure in consequence of the opposition of those from whom opposition was expected, then the war was a failure, because the rebellion was crushed out by force, and not by the voluntary consent of the confederate authorities. To admit that a plan must be agreed upon that will be satisfactory to the Bourbon element at the South will be admitting everything for which the northern democracy contended in 1864.

The plan of reconstruction that was finally adopted was not only the policy of the republican party but it was also the policy of the Government, for it involved everything which was supposed to have been accomplished as the result of the war. The colored people, being loyal to the Government and friendly to its policy, aside from the fact that they were the immediate beneficiaries of that policy, could not be expected to identify themselves with an organization the aims, the purposes, the tendencies, and the public declarations of which were in opposition to that policy, even though they may have been assured that their right and privileges would not be interfered with. The loyalty of the colored man to his Government is not measured by his personal interest. Even to admit that the promises made by the democracy to the colored voters were made in good faith and would have been carried out, still the colored man would not have been justified in affiliating with that organization so long as its policy was in opposition to that of the Government.

But the opposition of the democracy to the policy of the Government would not bring about such disastrous results, but for the fact that this opposition is so intense and intolerant as to render independent action on the part of white as well as colored men almost an impossibility. Except in some counties and localities, the Bourbon element inside of the ranks of the democracy at the South controls that organization and shapes its policy, and as a natural consequence there is a morbid public sentiment which renders life, liberty, and property comparatively insecure. In consequence of this intolerance, colored men are forced to vote for the candidates of the republican party, however objectionable to them some of these candidates may be, unless they are prevented from doing so by violence and intimidation. White men are compelled to vote for the candidates of the democratic party, however objectionable to them some of these candidates may be, or else suffer the consequences of being outcasts from society and destroyed in business.

As the South was governed even for a number of years anterior to the rebellion by an aristocracy that was antagonistic to every principle of true republicanism, it is not strange that the public sentiment of that section should be hostile to the principles embodied in the system of reconstruction that was adopted by the Government. As republican governments can only be sustained by the public sentiment of the people, however strange it may seem to some or humiliating to others, it is a fact, nevertheless, that until there shall have been a revolution in public opinion at the South—until an honest difference of opinion upon public questions shall be tolerated in white and colored men alike—until malice, passion, and prejudice shall give way to reason, argument, and persuasion, civil governments in harmony with the system of reconstruction that was adopted by the General Government can only be sustained and upheld by the power of the General Government—the power that crushed out the rebellion. And yet to sustain or tolerate a governmental system at the South hostile or inimical to the principles embodied in the reconstruction acts of Congress will be to acknowledge practically that the war was a failure, and that the policy of the Government toward the Southern States has been from the beginning a mistaken one.

#### DEMOCRATIC OPPOSITION TO THE CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS OF THE COLORED PEOPLE.

The facts of history will bear me out in asserting that the repulsive attitude of the democratic party toward the colored man has had

more to do with preventing the political affiliation of the two races than anything else; that united political action on the part of colored men has been and is still a matter of necessity in consequence of democratic opposition to them as a race and as a class is what every unprejudiced man must admit; that there is any necessity for united political action on the part of white men as such is what every fair-minded man must deny; that any considerable number of colored men can ever be induced to affiliate with the Democratic party of to-day is just as unreasonable as it is unnatural. Colored men can no more affiliate with the democratic party, as at present organized, than Catholics and foreign-born citizens could affiliate with the know-nothing party during the existence of that organization.

I can say to the democrats of the House and of the country, that the colored people are asking you every day to allow them to occupy an independent position in politics; to allow them to make their identification with a political organization a matter of choice and not of necessity; but thus far you have repulsed them on nearly every occasion. You tell them in nearly all of your political platforms; in nearly all of your leading papers; in nearly all of your political speeches; in nearly all of your political votes as members of Congress or of State Legislatures that they shall not be allowed to affiliate with any other than the republican party without self-humiliation and disgrace. I appeal to the leaders of the democracy in the name of humanity and justice, why continue this unjust, unnecessary, and uncharitable opposition to this powerless and defenseless race? You know that they are not your enemies; they do not seek to harm you, or to deprive any of you of any of the rights and privileges that you are entitled to under the Constitution and laws of the country. They have been and are still cultivating the soil of the southern portion of this great country, and have produced with their labor the wealth that many of you are enjoying to-day. And now, what do they ask or demand of you? Nothing but a fair chance in the race of life. Protection and security through a healthy public opinion in the enjoyment of their rights and privileges as American citizens. It is strange, remarkably strange, that the democratic party should maintain such persistent and uniform opposition to the colored people.

Shame upon this once grand, noble, and patriotic organization, that it has so degenerated that it can have no nobler aim, no grander object, no higher aspiration than the degradation, humiliation, and political subjugation of an innocent, harmless, powerless as compared with the whites, and inoffensive race. Well may we exclaim, Mr. Chairman, O, democracy, where is thy generosity, where is thy magnanimity! It is true that a number of the leaders of your party profess to be in favor of protecting the colored people in the enjoyment of their rights. A number of these gentlemen I believe to be honest and sincere in these professions; but it is an unfortunate, a lamentable, fact that every proposition that has been presented thus far having for its object the elevation, advancement, and promotion of the colored race in the scale of civilization and morality, as we understand it, has met with your solid, united, and unbroken opposition.

I listened carefully and attentively not long since to a very able and eloquent speech that was delivered by the honorable gentleman from New York [Mr. Cox] in defense of the Indians, every word and sentence of which, so far as it related to the Indians, met with my hearty and cordial approval. But while he was delivering that speech this thought occurred to me: What a pity it is, how unfortunate it is, that some gentleman on that side of the House cannot be recognized as the advocate and defender of the colored race of America. So far as the gentleman from New York is concerned I have no hesitation in expressing it as my opinion that he personally wishes the colored people no harm. I look upon him as a kind, generous, benevolent man—as much so as it is possible for a democrat to be. But the aims, the purposes, and the tendencies of his party are such, the policy of his party is such, that he dare not stand upon the floor of the House of Representatives as the advocate and defender of the colored race of his country without placing himself in hostility to and in antagonism with the political organization with which he is at present unfortunately identified.

#### AN APPEAL TO REPUBLICANS.

To the republican members, Mr. Chairman, I desire to make what may be a final appeal. I use the word "final" because, as little as you may think of it, the condition of the colored people of the South to-day, if not of the whole country, is a seriously critical one. We are standing, as it were, upon the brink of our political and, I may add, personal destruction. When we look to the right, we find the angry billows of an enraged democracy seeking to overwhelm us. When we look to the left, we find that we are crushed to the earth, as it were, with an unjust and an unchristian prejudice. When we turn to the rear we find the assassin in certain portions of the country ready to plunge the dagger into our hearts for a public expression of our honest conviction. We turn our faces to you then as our friends, our advocates, our defenders, and our protectors.

Some of you may say that the colored man having been invested with the same political rights that are enjoyed by the whites he ought to be able to take care of himself. Plausible argument. To this we would have no objection if we were allowed to exercise and enjoy the rights and privileges thus conferred. But in some localities we are not. The democratic party has an armed military organ-

ization in several of the Southern States to-day called the White League. This organization has been brought into existence for the sole and exclusive purpose of accomplishing with the bullet that which cannot be accomplished with the ballot; for the purpose of controlling public opinion and carrying popular elections by violence and force of arms; for the purpose of destroying the freedom of speech, the freedom of opinion, the freedom of the press, and the protection of the ballot. Its mission is to accomplish practically within the Union that which could not be accomplished through the madness of secession. Not to establish an independent confederacy with slavery as its chief corner-stone, but, to use in substance the language of the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. Hill,] it is to crush out northern fanaticism at the South and to eliminate the negro from the politics of the country. The election held in my own State in November last is a striking illustration of the purpose for which this organization has been brought into existence.

But I do not propose to go into details upon that subject at this time. It is sufficient for me to say that that election was a sad and serious commentary upon our elective system and upon our republican form of government. Here is a State that would be just as certain to vote for the nominees of the Cincinnati convention in November next as any State in the Union if we could have toleration of opinion and a free, fair, orderly election. But under existing circumstances this State, with its known, acknowledged, admitted, unquestionable republican majority of from twenty to thirty thousand votes, will be just as certain to vote for the nominees of the Saint Louis convention as any State in the Union, simply because the republican organization has been crushed practically out of existence by the terrorism that has been inaugurated by this White-League organization. In several of the largest counties in that State to-day the republican party cannot as much as have an organized existence.

I ask the question in all seriousness, can the public sentiment of the country afford to sustain and tolerate this condition of affairs? If so, then the war was fought in vain and the billions of dollars spent for the preservation of the Union have been thrown away. To use the language of the honorable gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. House,] "the Union has only been restored in name, and the mighty conflict waged professedly to save it, a terrible and melancholy failure." We will have civil government in name but not in fact. I do not wish to be understood as endeavoring to convey the idea that all of the white people of my State who are not identified with the republican party are in sympathy with the White-League or Bourbon element; far from it. There is a large intelligent and respectable element among the whites of that State who are opposed to mob-law and violence and in favor of maintaining law and order and having every citizen protected in the enjoyment of his rights. It gives me pleasure to be able to bear testimony to the fact that there is not a more peaceable, orderly, and law-abiding people anywhere in the United States than those of the county and city in which I live. But, taking the State as a whole, it is an unfortunate fact that this liberal, moderate, conservative element is controlled and domineered over just as the Union element was in 1861.

I can fully recognize and appreciate the fact that there is a strong desire in the northern mind to blot out all of the unpleasant recollections engendered by the recent war. I am aware of the fact that there is a strong desire in the northern mind to have the issues growing out of the war dropped from the politics of the country. I confess that I share in this desire; for every man who knows anything about southern politics is aware of the fact that, if we ever expect to have a permanent republican organization in that section, it must be composed of men who fought the battles of the confederacy as well as those who fought the battles of the Union. And in this connection I will remark that the men who are instrumental in bringing into existence white leagues and other dangerous and mischievous organizations are not, as a rule, those who fought in the rank and file of either army, but they are men who never smelled powder in their lives, men who are particularly anxious to fight in times of peace but have no desire in that direction in times of war. While you are anxious to forget and forgive everything in connection with the war, let me admonish you, be careful that you do not allow your desire in that direction to become so intense as to render it possible for you to lose, practically, that which you are supposed to have accomplished as the result of the war.

#### CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I will say that the colored man does not ask his Government to protect him from violence as a colored man but as an American citizen. He does not ask to be protected in the right to vote the republican ticket, but to exercise the rights and privileges appertaining to American citizenship. It is a fact perhaps not generally known that the white man at the South who affiliates with the republican party, whether he be of northern or southern birth or whether he fought on the side of the Union or the side of the confederacy, is as much in need of this protection as the colored man. The colored man of the South appeals to the generosity of this great nation to-day to save him from personal if not political destruction. He appeals to the generous heart of what he believes to be a patriotic, just, and magnanimous people. He cannot believe that his appeal will be made in vain, but that the people of this great country will gratefully remember that, when the Union

was threatened with dissolution, when the Constitution was ignored and the flag of the country was draped in mourning, the colored man remained true to his country, true to the Constitution, and loyal to the flag of his country.

In making this appeal, it is nothing more than proper that I should state, as one who knows whereof he speaks, that, if you should desert us in this the hour of our troubles; if you leave us to perish at the hands of those who seek our destruction for no other reason than because of our devotion to principle, if not loyalty to the Government, you will have destroyed our hopes, banished our ambition, crushed out our energies, and buried our aspirations beneath the sod of political degradation, to which you will have so ungenerously assigned us. That it is possible for the American people to be guilty of such ingratitude as this is what I will not believe until I am forced to do it. In considering this subject I hope you will be governed by the same motives that actuated Patrick Henry when he gave utterance to that noble and patriotic declaration, "Give me liberty or give me death."

I yield whatever remains of my time to the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. LAWRENCE.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has fifteen minutes of his time remaining, which he yields to the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. LAWRENCE.] In the absence of that gentleman, the floor is given to the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. SAVAGE,] who has been recognized to follow the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, never having been a member of any legislative body until I took my seat as a member of the Forty-fourth Congress, I have heretofore felt that it were better for me to listen to others rather than to take an active part in the debates of this body, and in the opinion of many it may be that I am now too early in giving expression to my views. But it seems to me that the time has arrived when, without laying myself liable to the charge of egotism on the one hand or excessive modesty on the other, I can with propriety give expression to my views upon some of the important questions of the day. And right at the outset I feel compelled to find fault with the action of the party in the majority, of which I am one, and to me it is by no means a welcome task. This body, with an overwhelming democratic majority, has now been in session over six months, and, while they have done much worthy of commendation, candor compels me to say that they have fallen far short of what the country had a right to expect at their hands; not that I would charge the democratic majority with any acts of positive wrong, except as evil has resulted from their failure to act at all. Their sins are wholly of omission, not of commission.

In order that I may be properly understood, it will be necessary for me to indulge in a brief retrospective view of the country. At the close of the late war, a period of unexampled prosperity set in and continued for four or five years thereafter unabated and apparently without the slightest financial disturbance throughout our land. Notwithstanding the fact that the South at the close of the war was left prostrate and helpless, no sooner were the contending hosts on either side who were spared from the slaughter returned to the fields and the workshops than the reign of prosperity began, and the hum of the manufacturing establishments joined to the song of the plowman conspired to make the air vocal with the songs of peace and prosperity. All the laborers and mechanics of the country found employment without difficulty at remunerative wages; all of the manufacturing establishments in the country were run to their utmost capacity; the farmer sold all of his produce at fair rates; it would be but the literal truth to say that prosperity sat smiling at every door. Then it was that the ruinous policy of contraction was begun under the advice and threats of English capitalists, and has been since carried forward with merciless rigor, until it has bankrupted thousands of our manufacturers and deprived tens of thousands upon tens of thousands of our mechanics of their employment, and almost, if not quite, of daily food for themselves and their families. On the 31st of October, 1865, according to good authority, there was a circulating medium in the country of more than twice the volume that it is to-day, and which was confined almost wholly to the Northern States, by which I mean the States that were not engaged in rebellion.

Notwithstanding the addition of the Southern States, without a currency, with all of their industries paralyzed, their cotton fields idle, their laborers and mechanics almost in a state of starvation, the policy of contraction was steadily carried forward by the republican party until our available circulation was reduced to a sum not exceeding \$638,000,000, less than one-half what it was for the Northern States alone at the close of the war. To this legislation has been added another law which now stands upon your statute-books, proposing to reach a specie standard by the year 1879, which, according to the best lights we have now, would reduce your circulating medium to the sum of about one hundred and fifty or two hundred millions of dollars, or to less than one-third what it is to-day.

I know that some of the leading republican speakers in Ohio last fall asked the question, "When did the republican party contract the currency?" And that in answer to the question they proceeded to show that the withdrawal of forty-four millions of the currency was accomplished by Secretary McCulloch during the administration of Andrew Johnson, but they neglected to tell the people that McCulloch was a legacy handed down to President Johnson by his predecessor, Mr. Lincoln, and that the withdrawal of that amount of currency was in pursuance of an act of a republican Congress, and that the republican party is, therefore, responsible for it. It will not do

for the party who has been in unlimited control of the affairs of this Government for the past fifteen years to attempt to avoid responsibility for their acts by charging it to the administration of Mr. Johnson, who was himself elected by this same party. Indeed, some of the republican leaders go so far as to deny that there has been any contraction of the currency at all by the republican party. One instance which now occurs to me is that of a distinguished republican Senator, who denied in the most explicit manner that there had been any contraction of the currency at all, and charged that McCulloch retired all the compound-interest notes, time bills, and all interest-bearing and convertible bonds before Grant came into power, and he denied in the most emphatic manner that any of these securities ever at any time formed any part of the currency of the country, but that they were held exclusively for the accruing interest. The history of the country, however, shows that these interest-bearing bonds or notes almost exclusively took the place of the bank reserves, and to that extent at least answered the same purpose to the country as currency, by allowing the currency itself to be turned loose to circulate among the people. It is likewise equally true that, whenever there was any occasion for their use, these interest-bearing notes were actually circulated as a currency. I have seen them in circulation, and I have no doubt but that every member of this House has also seen them actually performing the office of money.

To show that I am not mistaken as to these interest-bearing notes and bonds being considered as a part of the currency of the country, I quote from the message of President Grant of December 1, 1873. He said:

During the last four years the currency has been contracted, directly by the withdrawal of 3 per cent. certificates, compound-interest notes, and 7.30 bonds outstanding on the 4th of March, 1869, all of which took the place of legal-tenders in the bank reserves to the extent of \$63,000,000.

Two most singular misapprehensions of the distinguished Senator to which I have alluded will be exposed by an examination of this quotation from the President's message. The Senator says "they did not form any part of the currency, but were held for the accruing interest." The President says the currency was contracted by their withdrawal. The Senator says, and I use his exact language, "these were all retired by McCulloch and before Grant came into power." Grant says that to the extent of \$63,000,000 they had been withdrawn "during the last four years" and that to that extent at least they were "outstanding on the 4th day of March, 1869," which was the date of the commencement of his first term.

The Senator further denied that resuming specie payment in 1879, according to the legislation of the last Congress, would contract the currency; but, on the other hand, claimed that the great body of our currency could be floated at par with gold. I had heretofore taken it for granted that our republican friends expected to confine the people strictly to a "hard-money" currency, or if a paper currency be issued, that, like Amasa Walker, they would say, "No issues should be made except upon specie in hand." I supposed they would not dare to come before the people and say that they were in favor of a return to the old system of banking upon a specie basis; for the people of this country never want to see the day again when we have a paper currency like that of 1857, which amounted to between fifteen and sixteen dollars *per capita*, with but \$2 in specie to redeem it. But here is substantially the old system proposed by this distinguished financier of the republican party. About the only difference is that we are to have national instead of State banks. The proposition is to attempt to float between seven and eight hundred million dollars of redeemable paper upon a basis of \$150,000,000 in gold. Wherein does this proposition of the Senator differ from the old wild-cat system? And what prevents a run being made upon the banks, and consequent failure to pay, and the ever-recurring result—a panic? So long as your banks are permitted to issue five or six dollars in paper to one of specie in hand there will always be panics whenever there is a run made upon them, and, to my mind, it is folly to expect anything else. The Senator also proposes to put the United States Treasury in the same dangerous condition as the banks, that is, they are to have United States Treasury notes outstanding payable on demand in gold to the extent of five or six dollars to one in gold in the Treasury to redeem them, and of course their legal-tender quality will be taken from them, notwithstanding his views to the contrary. It does not require a person of very great genius to see that, in case a run should be made upon the Treasury for payment or redemption of the outstanding notes, the United States, just like any other corporation doing a banking business, would have to suspend. In the event of such a contingency arising, I would like to ask some who favor this financial scheme about how much below par, in their opinion, these notes would sink?

It seems to me that the proposition to return to a specie standard involves one of two things: either a return to hard money or paper issued dollar for dollar, or a return to the old system of banking, or one in substance the same. To the second alternative I am opposed. Neither do I believe that the people of the United States will ever consent to a return to that iniquitous system of robbing the many for the benefit of the few. In the last annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency he makes use in this language:

The experience of this country, previous to the organization of the national banking system, has shown that in twenty years an amount equal to its whole banking circulation was lost in the hands of the people, the loss by bills of broken banks alone being computed to have been at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum.



With this showing before them I do not think the people of this country ought to be in great haste to return to a system of banking on specie such as we are invited to by this republican party legislation.

We hear a great deal of talk about "honest money" among a certain class of politicians, but for one I do not want any more of that class of honest money, that one-twentieth of the entire circulation of the country becomes entirely worthless in the hands of the people each year, their loss being pocketed by that class of bankers who are not above playing the knave by enriching themselves at the expense of their less-favored neighbors. And not only a twentieth, but in some years, according to this same authority, the people who are compelled to handle this money have been known to suffer a loss of one-fifth of the entire bank capital of the country. Who is there among the business men of the country that is willing or desirous to return to specie payment unless some system can be devised that will promise better results than those given by the Comptroller of the Currency? And what better system can be devised while you have but \$150,000,000 gold in the country to form that basis of which we hear so much talk? It is not a specie basis to which you are invited to return, for you cannot return to that which you never had, and I affirm that you never had in this country a specie basis in the true sense of those words; but, on the contrary, four-fifths of your circulation, in many instances before the war, was built upon credit, and credit alone, there not being more than one dollar in coin in the vaults of the banks to redeem five of the paper dollars that were in circulation, and that on their face purported to be redeemable in coin, but which every man of sense knew to be a glaring falsehood. It seems to me, therefore, unless we have deliberately determined to return to the old credit system of banking, that it is scarcely less than criminal to talk of a return to a specie basis, so long as our supply of specie is so limited as at present.

President Grant in his message in 1873, speaking of the currency, uses this language:

*In view of the great actual contraction that has taken place in the currency, and the comparative contraction continuously going on, due to the increase of population, increase of manufactories, and all the industries, I do not believe there is too much of it now for the dullest period of the year.*

If Grant was right in using this language when we had over six hundred millions of currency, what shall we think of the party which proposes, notwithstanding constant increase of population, to reduce our circulation to less than two hundred millions? I do not wish to be understood from what I have said as being opposed to a specie standard when that can be reached without bringing bankruptcy and ruin in its train. On the contrary, I would be glad to see the day when we can adopt a specie standard without injury to the manufacturing and producing classes of our country. And I would not willingly do any act that would put off that desirable day. But I do not believe a specie standard can be reached until our exports are sufficiently increased to pay for our imports, interest due abroad, and other specie obligations, and at the same time have an appreciable accumulation of the precious metals in our country. And I believe with President Grant, as expressed in his message before quoted from, that—

*To increase our exports sufficient currency is required to keep all the industries of the country employed. Without this, national as well as individual bankruptcy must ensue.*

I am therefore in favor of the adoption of some plan by which the volume of currency will be regulated by natural laws and will always correspond with the demands of trade, and not be left to be constantly tampered with according to the whims of partisan politicians or the bankers and money-lenders of the country.

I am in favor of the immediate and unconditional repeal of that stupendous folly of the republican party known as the specie-resumption act; and what is the most surprising thing to my mind is the fact that, although there is a democratic majority in this House of nearly two-thirds, and petitions and letters have poured in upon us by the thousand begging and praying for its repeal, it still stands upon our statute-books untouched even by the action of this House. Why is this? It is not because there are any democrats here who are in favor of this law; for in my opinion there are not a dozen of the majority in this House who would say that if that law was now pending before this House they would support it. We know as a matter of history that every democrat in both branches of Congress voted against it, and that it was put through under the whip and spur as a party measure in order to bridge over the presidential election. And we honor that noble band of democrats who, though in a minority, yet stood up with a united front against its original passage. Once at least, if not twice, a proposition for its repeal has received a majority vote in this House; but in consequence of not having been reported by a committee, it failed to pass for want of a two-thirds vote in its favor.

I am told by those having experience in these matters that in days gone by a majority vote in favor of a proposition has been taken as instructions by the committee having the matter in charge; and that in consequence such committee always reported a bill in accordance with the views of the majority as expressed by a vote in the House. But not so with our Committee on Banking and Currency. They seem to be determined to prevent its repeal; and why? Is it because they think it is a good law? I do not think so; for I do not

believe there is a democrat on that committee who would not say that he thought it ought to be repealed; but when you ask them why they do not report a bill for its repeal, you will be told that while they favor its repeal, they think something should be substituted in its place, and that the democrats cannot agree upon a plan for resumption to take the place of this republican plan which it is proposed to repeal.

In God's name, gentlemen, if you mean what you say, and you are really in favor of the repeal of this iniquitous law, why not report your bill for its unconditional repeal, and discuss your substitute afterward; or do you mean to hold the present law over our heads as a means of driving gentlemen who hold the same views that I do into the support of measures for specie resumption dictated by the bondholders of the East, and but little if any improvement upon the present law? If such is your intention, I serve notice on you now that you will have to wait until you get a Congress composed of different men than the present. We do not propose to be driven by a small minority of the democrats on this floor into the support of any scheme which would involve the destruction of the dearest rights of our constituents, and the dishonor of ourselves as their representatives on this floor. No, gentlemen; if that is your plan you might just as well abandon it at once, and not wait until you are driven to do your duty by the uncontrollable force of public opinion. If you persist in your refusal to do that which the plainest dictates of common justice requires at your hands, you will be repudiated by the people whom you have betrayed, as you will richly deserve to be. I speak now to the democratic majority on this floor, for it is to them that the people look for relief in this matter. Will you continue to refuse to do that which in your hearts you confess ought to be done merely for the purpose of forcing upon us a measure which you know would receive no support upon its own merits? Or will you not rather like honest men, as you are, come forward and repeal this law and then submit your plans and let them stand or fall by their merits or demerits as independent measures? Give us a chance to have a square vote upon the repeal of this law, and then do not complicate it with any proposition for forced resumption of specie payment. You cannot bring about specie payments by acts of Congress before the business interests of the country are ready for it, and to my mind it is utter madness to attempt it. All such attempts will be futile and will end in the bankruptcy and ruin of thousands of our most enterprising business men, who are more or less involved and are now straining every nerve to keep up. On the other hand, whenever we are in a condition to maintain specie payment, after we have resumed it will take but little legislation to bring about the resumption, and I am one of those who do not wish to undertake to resume until we are in a condition to maintain resumption.

There is another subject closely allied to this which I wish to consider briefly.

The democracy of Ohio have placed themselves upon the record in favor of the withdrawal of the present national-bank circulation and the issuing of legal-tender currency in its stead. Is not this proposition one that is eminently just to the people of this country? I know we are told by some of the leading radical speakers and journals that the legal-tenders are simply "irredeemable rags," and but little, if any, better than confederate scrip. I know also that these speakers and journals only a few years ago charged every one with disloyalty and treason who dared even to intimate a doubt as to the propriety of making greenbacks a legal tender. Notwithstanding all this, I am unable to see any reason why the legal-tenders are not as good as national-bank money which is redeemable in legal-tenders, and if by substituting the money in which the national-bank money is redeemable we can save from eighteen to twenty million dollars a year to the people, I am in favor of the substitution. I do not object to the national-bank currency because it is not a safe currency; on the contrary, I regard the currency of the national banks as perfectly safe; but I see no good reason why the people of this country should pay eighteen or twenty millions each year to the bankers of the country for a currency which is in no respect better than one they can obtain without any of that outlay.

Now, how is this most reasonable proposition met by the republican party and those democrats who belong to the national banks of the country? Why, we are told that under the pledge contained in the act of 1864 we are limited to the sum of \$400,000,000, and that it would be a violation of the plighted faith of the nation if a single dollar beyond that amount should be issued. Now, if gentlemen who make this objection are right in their views of the law, it must be confessed that this is an insuperable obstacle in the way of ever carrying into effect the change proposed by the Ohio democracy, unless they avoid the force of the objection by substituting a currency such as was proposed by the bill offered by Mr. Beck, of Kentucky, in the Forty-third Congress; that is, to give the Treasury notes exactly the same qualities as a circulating medium that is now possessed by the national-bank circulation, and not make them legal tenders. But the Ohio democracy say they are in favor of "the gradual but early substitution of legal-tenders for national-bank notes." Without considering whether it was wise to declare that the Treasury note to be substituted for the national-bank note should be a legal tender, I propose to briefly consider the question as to whether under the legislation of Congress we are prohibited from issuing legal-tenders in excess of \$400,000,000 for the purpose of supplying the place of

the present national-bank currency. The law which it is claimed contains the limitation is in these words:

Nor shall the total amount of United States notes issued, or to be issued, ever exceed \$400,000,000, and such additional sum not exceeding \$50,000,000 as may be temporarily required for the redemption of the temporary loan.

Now, if it can be shown from the reading of this law, and from the circumstances under which it was enacted, that it was the intention of the Congress which enacted it, and that the only construction of the law is to limit all future Congresses in their power to enact a law for the issuing of legal-tenders, no matter what may be the circumstances, to the sum of \$400,000,000, and not merely to limit the officers of the United States under the laws then in force. I say in my opinion if this could be shown it would demonstrate in the most palpable manner the unconstitutionality of the law. For if under the Constitution Congress has the right to make Treasury notes a legal tender, no act of one Congress can take that right away from another. In other words, one Congress cannot limit the constitutional rights and powers of another. I am not now discussing the question as to whether Congress has the right to make anything else besides gold and silver a legal-tender; or whether, if they have that right, it is confined exclusively to times of great public emergencies, as some gentlemen have claimed; but I am taking it for granted that at least under some circumstances they have that right, and from that I deduce the proposition that whenever those circumstances arise Congress has the right and power to provide for their issue, without regard to any past legislation of any former Congress or of the same Congress. And if the Congress which enacted this law attempted any such thing as to put a limitation upon the power of future Congresses, they went beyond their constitutional power and the act to that extent is null and void. But I maintain that no such intention as that of limiting the constitutional powers of future Congresses existed at the time of the passage of this law, but the evident intention was to limit the United States officers, who were charged with the duty of issuing these notes, in the amount to be issued under and by virtue of the laws in force at that time. I am sustained in this conclusion by the construction which Congress and the people have put upon a similar statute. In February, 1862, Congress enacted a law containing this proviso in relation to the legal-tenders and demand notes:

That the amount of the two kinds of notes together shall at no time exceed the sum of \$150,000,000.

This language, I might say is equally as comprehensive as that contained in the act of 1864. Yet the same Congress which enacted this law, containing this positive language, in less than ninety days thereafter passed another law in which they authorized the issuing of one hundred and fifty millions more, making the aggregate \$300,000,000. They must have construed the act of 1862 as I construe that of 1864, or else they willfully and knowingly violated the plighted faith of the nation to the holders of the first one hundred and fifty millions. And if Congress had a right to construe the act of February 25, 1862, as not in any manner limiting their rights, then plainly the same construction can and ought to be placed upon the act of 1864. And in my opinion the forced construction which has recently been put upon that act would never have been heard of had it not been that over four hundred millions of concentrated bank capital is interested in having that construction adopted as the true one. And by the powerful influence of this net-work of banks, primary elections and conventions of the people are manipulated, and men are set up and pulled down almost at their will, and by their well-organized lobby the very fountains of legislation have been corrupted, and the people are groaning to-day under an increased weight of taxation as the result. And unless the people rise in their might and hurl from power the party which has betrayed their trust, they will find that their trials and hardships have but just begun.

There are many objectionable features in the present banking system, some only of which I have time to notice. From the returns made on the 12th day of September, 1873, which was about one week prior to the money panic of 1873, we learn the astounding fact that the banks of this country were drawing interest upon nearly \$714,000,000, more than their entire capital, including surplus fund and undivided profits. On this vast sum of money the banks were drawing interest, when in reality they were not the owners of one dollar of it. Is it any wonder that they should be able to declare large dividends, when they were receiving interest upon all of their capital and upon seven hundred and fourteen millions in addition thereto?

This sum if loaned at but 5 per cent. shows that the banks draw from the laboring and producing interest of the country each year more than \$35,000,000, for which they return no equivalent whatever. Here is an abuse which calls loudly for correction; but I despair of being able to accomplish anything in the way of legislation looking to the relief of the country from this incubus, so long as one branch of Congress contains a majority of their avowed champions and the other has so many who are afraid to have the money power arrayed against them in their congressional districts. I despair of having any legislation on this subject until the people speak to their representatives in tones which cannot be misunderstood. Then, and not till, then, will there be legislation abridging the almost unlimited power of this gigantic monster, which has grown up in our midst

almost imperceptibly, and which is stealthily sapping the very foundations of our Government.

But it is said that they are entirely safe, and that the people will never lose any of their money by broken banks so long as they furnish the circulation. That is true so far as their circulation is concerned, but, managed as they have been in the past, I deny that they are anything else than the fruitful source of money panics, just such as we witnessed in September, 1873. Let us take their condition at that time and see what chance there was for them to have done otherwise than they did do.

Their immediate liabilities were as follows:

Bank-notes outstanding.....	\$339,081,709
Individual deposits.....	622,685,563
United States deposits.....	7,820,327
Deposits by United States officers.....	8,093,560
<b>Total immediate liabilities.....</b>	<b>977,685,249</b>

Their immediate resources were as follows:

Legal-tenders.....	\$92,347,663
Specie.....	19,868,469
United States certificates of deposits.....	20,610,000
<b>Total immediate resources.....</b>	<b>132,826,132</b>

It will be observed from these statistics that the banks were in condition to redeem but 13 or 14 per cent. of the amount they had outstanding, and which was liable to be called for at any moment. When there was a run made upon them of course they could do nothing but suspend; and, as we all recollect, they did suspend.

I do not pretend to be able to furnish a remedy for all of these evils, but that such evils exist is patent to the most casual observer, and much would be accomplished in the way of remedying them by cutting off the right of the banks to issue a currency and by confining them to a legitimate banking business and by restoring the circulating medium to the Government, where it should have been from the commencement. Why should these national banks throughout the country have any more right to issue a currency than any of the thousands of other banks who aid in carrying on the commercial transactions of the country, without this prerogative, which really belongs to sovereignty and ought never to have been delegated by the Government to any private corporations? I have no disposition to quarrel with the banks or to take any rights away from them which justly belong to them. They are necessary institutions in a great commercial country such as ours, and no one but a fool would wish to cripple their necessary functions. But the prerogative of issuing a currency is no part of the necessary functions appertaining to the banks, and I am decidedly in favor of lopping it off at as early a day as practicable, without deranging the business interests of the country, and returning it to the Government, where it legitimately belongs.

I yield the residue of my time to the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. SMITH.]

Mr. SMITH, of Georgia. I would inquire of the Chair how much time is left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has thirty minutes of his time yet unexpired, which he has yielded to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COOK. Inasmuch as it is now five o'clock, I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. REAGAN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. BLACKBURN reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 3263) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending 30th of June, 1877, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### PAYMENT TO WIDOW OF DECEASED MEMBER-ELECT.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution to which I think there can be no objection. It is in relation to the pay of a deceased member.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations be directed to insert the following item in the bill making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877:

To enable the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to the widow of Garnet McMillan, late Member-elect of this House from the ninth district of Georgia, a sum equal to the salary of a member of Congress for three months, being the sum of \$1,250.

Mr. HOLMAN. That may be all correct, but I think the resolution should not be imperative.

Mr. HILL. I have copied precisely the form of a similar resolution adopted during this present session.

Mr. RANDALL. This is not properly an item for the sundry civil bill. This payment should come out of the contingent fund.

Mr. HOLMAN. If the resolution were made one merely of inquiry, it might be taken into account in determining what the amount of the contingent fund shall be. But this resolution as now drawn leaves no discretion with the committee as to the form in which this should be passed. I suggest to the gentleman that he simply direct the committee to inquire into the subject.

Mr. HILL. Very well. As I have stated, this is copied precisely

from a resolution adopted during this session of Congress. But I am willing that it shall be modified so as merely to direct the committee to inquire.

Mr. RANDALL. Did we not agree to transact no business?

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to inquire of the Chair whether it is the order of the House that no business shall be transacted to-morrow?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair understands that that is the order of the House.

Mr. RANDALL. We may let this resolution go, if it be made one of inquiry merely; but I submit for the future, while this order is in operation, we cannot even by unanimous consent transact any business.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Indiana. I would like to hear the resolution read as it is proposed to modify it.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Committee on Appropriations inquire into the propriety of inserting the following item in the sundry civil appropriation bill, &c.

The resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was given to Mr. NORTON for eight days.

#### LEAVE TO PRINT.

By unanimous consent, Mr. CATE obtained leave to print in the RECORD, as part of the debates, some remarks he had prepared in regard to commercial relations with Canada. [See Appendix.]

And then, on motion of Mr. COOK, (at five o'clock and ten minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

The following memorials, petitions, and other papers were presented at the Clerk's desk under the rule, and referred as stated:

By Mr. BANNING: The petition of B. Kittredge & Co. of Cincinnati, John L. Moore's Sons of New York, and other wholesale dealers in military and sporting arms in Saint Louis, New Orleans, and Philadelphia, declaring that new and good arms issued by the General Government to the States for the armament of the militia, bearing the inspection mark of the Government, have been thrown upon the market in the city of New York, and other places, and asking for such legislation as will prevent the executives of States from selling arms issued for the armament of the militia, to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. BOONE: The petition of citizens of Trigg and Lyon Counties, Kentucky, that the tariff laws remain unchanged, to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPIN: The petition of Jonas A. Champney and 60 others, for one condemned cannon and two cannon-balls for ornamenting the burial ground at South Adams, Massachusetts, to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMAN: Memorial of P. R. Sawyer, of Madison County, Illinois, against the squandering of the public lands, against a monopoly of said lands or in the finances of the country, and against favoritism in legislation, to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, the petition of citizens of Jackson County, Indiana, for the restoration of the pension of George Green, a soldier of the Mexican war, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, the petition of architects of the city of Washington, District of Columbia, that House bill No. 2328 be amended so as to include the public buildings of the District of Columbia in its provisions, to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBERTS: The petition of Margaret Kenah, widow of Patrick Kenah, Company D, First United States Artillery, for a pension, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania: Remonstrance of Henry Rowe, George C. Rowe, Thomas Lindsey, Edmund Burke, and 160 others, against the reduction of import duties upon foreign goods which enter into competition with their respective manufactures, to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAITE: The petition of William H. Latham, for an honorable discharge as an acting volunteer lieutenant in the Navy, to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The following petition was presented at the Clerk's desk under the rule without having indorsed thereon the name of any member of the House, and referred as stated: The petition of citizens of Webster County, Iowa, that the United States Supreme Court be requested to cause to be issued by the Federal courts of Iowa a general injunction restraining all persons from mining, or any other operation whatever, save and except the cultivation of the soil by the actual settlers on all so-called Des Moines River land in Iowa, to the Committee on Public Lands.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, June 14, 1876.

The House met at twelve o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. I. L. TOWNSEND.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair would state that by the order made yesterday by unanimous consent this day is to be devoted exclusively to the consideration of the Army appropriation bill; that there will be no morning hour, and no other business will be transacted.

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. ATKINS,] in one portion of his remarks when about to introduce his request to make the order, said this:

On Friday morning I expect to explain the different sections of the bill, and may require rather more than five minutes to do so.

I merely want to ask for information whether he did not mean on Thursday morning, that is, to-morrow.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair presumes that the gentleman meant that the debate under the five-minute rule should proceed to-morrow. This day is exclusively for general debate on the Army bill.

#### ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The House then resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. BLACKBURN in the chair,) and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 3717) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1877, and for other purposes.

#### CURRENCY.

Mr. SMITH, of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a few reflections on those subjects usually embraced in the term "currency," and in doing so I shall not be vain enough to assume the power of declaring to this House any new principle of finance or any new fact in history. I shall content myself with such impressions of my subject as the average business, not scientific, citizen usually receives and retains. I shall avoid all technicalities and all appearances of a scientific disquisition and shall treat my subject in a practical way.

It must be evident to all that the more learned and scientific our financial doctors are the greater is their difference, and the less hope of an agreement among them.

A casual survey of the condition of the people and Government of the United States does not produce the most encouraging impressions. The cry for relief to Congress comes from every section of this great country, from every industry, and from every grade of human life. The distress is paralyzing the manufacturer, the merchant, the mechanic, the farmer, and the laborer; and, so far from touching the bottom of this financial quicksand and re-ascending, it seems as if we were sinking deeper and deeper, and our condition becoming gradually worse and worse.

The close of the war found us in possession of an inflated and depreciated currency, (amounting to \$1,152,914,892,) and, measured by it, the value of all kinds of property and the price of every description of labor ruled high in amount. Confidence in the final redemption of the currency was then wanting, and this feeling of insecurity produced a general desire to exchange it for property and thereby preserve its value. Then, the passion for speculation and accumulation of wealth, created during the war, was universal and irresistible. Our people had become extravagant and reckless. This state of things was soon followed by a practical reduction of the amount of legal-tender notes, and so continued until the amount was reduced to less than four hundred millions. A general shrinkage of the value of property and a general reduction in the price of labor were experienced throughout the entire country. Confidence in the ability and intention of the Government and people to discharge the national debt was established on a firm basis. To these great and rapid changes may be added the fact that since 1863, and during this period, the currency has been gradually yet surely concentrating at a few great money centers, producing as a natural result a scarcity of money at other points, a shrinkage of values, the destruction of individual and mutual confidence, the hoarding of currency, and the prostration of all kinds of business and occupations, resulting in a general outburst from the people for relief. Incident to this state of distress may be mentioned the fact that, since 1860, there has been a large increase of national and State indebtedness over the increase of population. The taxes of the United States, individual States, counties, and municipal corporations are fivefold what they were in 1860, while our population has not increased in proportion. These facts, considered in connection with the disastrous depreciation of property everywhere, show the real condition of the country in a strong but faithful light. Our people are overburdened with taxes; their earnings are absorbed and their hopes and energies are paralyzed by them.

Believing, at the time, that the condition of our industries was owing in part to the want of a sufficient and flexible circulating medium, early in the session I introduced a bill to repeal the tax of 10 per cent. on the issue of State banks and private bankers. I was induced to believe if this were done we could retain in our several States a domestic or local currency that would supply our necessities and afford us some relief. I felt and believed then that such a local circulation would have the same relative value and be controlled by the same general financial laws that operate upon our national paper currency; that such currency would remain at home in circulation among our people and would not be carried away; that it would be treated by the people of our sister-States just as our national currency is treated by the people of foreign countries. I followed my